THE PRE-MAURYAN
HISTORY OF BIHAR

By

DEVASAHAYA TRIVEDA,

M. A. PH D.

Published by

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

BOOKSELLERS & PUBLISHERS

Nepali Khapra : : BANARAS

First Edition] 1953 [*Price Rs.* 10/-

Printed at
Swatantra Nava Bharat Press, Patna.

PATNA UNIVERSITY;
PATNA.

December 15, 1944.

I know Dr. Devasahaya Triveda, who is a native of the Shahabad District. After taking his M.A. Degree, he submitted a thesis for the Ph. D. degree of the Patna University on "The Pre-Mauryan History of Bihar". The Board of Examiners consisted of Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar of Madras, Dr A. S. Altekar of the Benares Hindu University and Dr. S. C. Sarkar of the Patna University. Two of the examiners recommended that the degree of Ph. D. be conferred upon him, but the Board thought it desirable to hold a *viva-voce* examination so that, if possible, its decision might preferably be unanimous. As Dr. S. K. Aiyangar could not attend the meeting of the Board at Patna, at that time, owing to ill-health, I was asked by the other two members of the Board to preside over its meeting, in my capacity as the Vice-Chancellor of the University which I did. The questions put to the candidate by the two examiners (Dr. Altekar and Dr. Sarkar) were very searching ; but he gave what was regarded by the Board as satisfactory answers, in the sense that they were sound, accurate and to the point. Altogether, the candidate made a very good impression on the Board, as a whole, with the result that they unanimously recommended to the Syndicate that the degree of Ph. D. be conferred on him, the diploma for which I presented to him at the annual Convocation of the University held last month (November, 1944). I may add that Dr. Triveda is the first Bihari to have obtained this high distinction of the Patna University in History, as the one previous holder of this degree obtained his diploma in Oriental learning.

Sachchidananda Sinha
Vice-Chancellor.

नत्वा नत्वा गुरोः पादौ स्मारं स्मारं च भारतीम् ।
विहारवर्णनं कुर्मः पादौ नत्वा पितुर्भृशम ॥१॥
संदर्शिताः सुपन्थानः पूर्वैतिह्यविशारदैः
अयोरन्ध्रे तडिद्विद्धे तन्त्रीवास्तु सुखं गतिः ॥२॥
प्राचीनस्य विहारस्य महिमा केन न श्रुतः
द्वीपान्तरेषु लोकेषु सद्भिरद्यापि गीयते ॥३॥

Natvā natvā guroḥ pādau smāraṁ smāraṁ ca bhāratīm /
Vihāravarṇanaṁ kurmaḥ pādau natvā pitur bhṛśam // 1 //
Sandarśitāḥ supanthānaḥ pūrvaitihyaviśāradaiḥ /
Ayorandhre taḍidviddhe tantrīvāstu sukhaṁ gatiḥ // 2 //
Prācīnasya Vihārasya mahimā kena na śrutaḥ /
Dvīpāntareṣu lokeṣu sadbhiradyāpi gīyate // 3 //

GOVERNOR
UTTAR PRADESH.

September 23, 1952.

I have read the proofs of Dr. Triveda's Pre-Mauryan History of Bihar. History in India starts from the 7th century B. C. with the rise of the Magadhan Empire, and any light upon an earlier period would be of great value in appreciating the power and culture which are generally associated with the rise of Magadh as an imperial power. Dr. Triveda's book, which is the result of close study, will add to our existing knowledge of this early period.

K. M. Munshi.

PREFACE

The Cimmerian veil of darkness is spread over many an obscure areas in the early history of Bihar and so it is possible to throw light only here and there to find out something really desirable. For over a thousand years the history of Bihar or ancient Magadha is the history of India and in Bihar alone exist the invaluable materials for the study of ancient Indian history and culture in its various aspects which perhaps can be had nowhere else. 'Prior to the Sātavāhana[1] conquest of Magadha in the first century B. C. that country was the predominant power in India. From the time of the kings of Nanda dynasty the lead of Magadha had been unquestionably recognised by all nations of northern India and its capital Pāṭaliputra had become the metropolis'.[2]

Dr. A. S. Altekar, Benares Hindu University, in his presidential address to the Archāeic Section of the Indian History Congress, Calcutta, made a fervent appeal to reconstruct the pre-Bhārata history of India. 'The various pre-Bhārata War dynasties' according to him, 'are as real and historical as the Śiśunāgas and the Mauryas' and 'one can be fully justified in reconstructing the political and literary history of the period[3] with the help of the Purāṇas and other sources.

The region south of the Ganges and east of Kāśī was the land of the Kāruṣas which extended upto the sea. It was invaded by a scion of the Ānavas from the north-west frontier in circa 2, 567 B.C. and they made themselves masters of the major portion of the country with Campā as their capital. Later on Vasu, a king of Cedi—of the Lunar dynasty—brought Magadha and the adjoining portion under his sway, and from him descended the Bṛhadratha dynasty of Magadha. Jarāsan-

1. The name Sātavāhana or Śātakarṇī is uniformly found in their epigraphic documents, whereas the name Āndhra is conspicuous by its absence. The name Āndhra was probably applied to them at a later period when they lost their hold over their vast dominions in the north and west and beacme a purely Āndhra power.

2. The Age of the Imperial Guptas, by R. D. Banerji, 1933, p. 5.

3. 'Can we Reconstruct Pre-Bhārat War History'? p. 19.

dha, the Great, extended his glory as far as Mathurā, and brought more than a hundred kings under his sway. Bimbisāra and other kings of Magadha in ancient times often went on *digvijaya* (=tour of conquest) and styled themselves *dharmavijayins*[1] who did not annex the territory of the vanquished kings. It was Mahāpadma Nanda who acted like an *asuravijayin* and annihilated almost all his contemporary kings in India. Since then for a very long time 'the standard of Magadha was the standard of India and its people and kings were regarded worthy of imitation'.

Arrangement and Special Features.

The whole book is divided into 17 Chapters. The advent of the Aryans and their relations with the Vrātyas are discussed fully in the first chapter.

I have dealt next with the history of the various dynasties the came to exist in the State under consideration. The various dynasties of the pre-Mauryan period have been traced to the pre-Mauryan texts and it has been endeavoured to reconstruct their history on the basis of all the reliable authorities whether early or late. I have tried to put the ancient kings of Vaiśālī in their historical sequence shorn of their exaggerated accounts.

The history of Videha presents many difficulties in identifying the Puranic names with those of the Jātakas, and a great part of it is still shrouded in mystery. It is still an unaccomplished task to bring to light the 28 kings of Mithilā from the ocean of oblivion. Like Mithilā and other dynasties of Bihar, Aṅga also merged in the powerful dynasty of Magadha.

The role of Magadha has been dealt with at great length. As regards the post-war Bṛhadrathas, I have differed from Pargiter and Jayaswal—alas ! now no more to serve the cause of Indology—and showed by the reconstructive principle that 32 kings ruled for 1,001 years.

1. Vallabha's Comment on Raghuvaṁśa, IV. 43.

It has been held so far that the Pradyotas had nothing to do with Magadha and they were the contemporaries of Buddha and ruled at Ujjayinī. H. D. Bhide has shown on definite evidence that they were the actual rulers of Magadha and flourished centuries before the Buddha. This is confirmed by further evidence supplied by me.

The Śiśunāga dynasty has been dealt with chiefly with the materials collected by the late K. P. Jayaswal in the pages of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society. While dealing with the interval between Parīkṣita and Nanda I have discussed the existing theories and proved on textual and astronomical data that the controversial stanza can mean nothing more nor less than 1,500 or 1,501 years to be more exact. This lends further support to the Pradyota dynasty ruling in Magadha.

The Nanda dynasty shows the utter annihilation of all the other dynasties in India with the final triumph of Magadha in the arena of Indian history. It has been possible for me to trace the dated history of Magadha from B. C. 1,867 onwards precisely, although I cannot claim the same exactness for the period preceding it as the facts to which exact dates cannot be assigned, although they may be invaluable for the purpose of ethnology, philology and other sciences, are of no use to the historian.[1] I have tried to collect all the available materials and to give them due consideration.

Kāruṣa and Karkakhaṇḍa are put in the end of history on account of their comparatively scanty sources although their geological strata is much older in comparison to the north Bihar. A short note on the "Pre-historic Finds at Buxar" has been added in connection with the Karuṣas.

While dealing with the history of Karkakhaṇḍa (Chotanagpur) I differed in places from the late Sarat Chandra Roy, who kindly revised the chapter on Karkakhaṇḍa and

1. Smith's *Early History of India*, 1914, p. 27.

offered many suggestions. He remarked : 'He has gone through and sifted all available materials. So far as the history of Chotanagpur is concerned the materials are so scanty, mainly consisting of traditions and a few archaeological remains of pre-historic man that in the present state of our knowledge, a connected history is hardly possible to construct but Dr. Triveda has made the best of such materials he has been able to lay hands on.' His book "The Muṇḍa and his Country" proved very handy. Notes on the pre-historic Archāeology of Chotanagpur and on the Yogimārā cave inscription have been added to enhance the utility of the subject.

The Geography of early Bihar has been described in XVI Chapter and the various sources of history for the period are evaluated in the last chapter of the book.

I may explain that I have differed in places from many current or accepted presentations of theories simply because very many important chapters of Indian history have to be really revised and brought upto date in view of the fresh data coming to light so voluminiously. If I have erred, I can only crave the indulgence of the scholars and pray : 'Lead me from darkness to light (*Tamaso mā jyotir gamaya*).

Gratitude

I am beholden to Dr. Rajendra Prasad who introduced me to the publisher of this book. My grateful thanks are due to Śrī Śrīprakāśa, Dr. Syed Mahmud, Dr. K. K. Datta, Śrī S. P. Varma (Ex-Judge, Patna High Court), The Hon'ble the Chief Justice Śrī B. P. Sinha, Nagpur High Court, Śrī S. V. Sohani, I. C. S., and Śrī N. V. Śarmā who helped me in various ways in the writing and publication of the book. I owe a debt of deep gratitude to the late Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, the father of modern Bihar and my esteemed patron, for his many-fold help to me.

My heart-felt thanks go to Śrī K. M. Munshi for his adding a Foreword to it.

D. S. Triveda

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS.

Ag.	.... Agni Purāṇa.
AIHT.	....Pargiter's Ancient Indian Historical Traditions.
AMSMK	....Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūla Kalpa, (Ed. K. P. J.)
AV.	....Atharva Veda.
Bd	....Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa.
Bhāg.	....Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa.
Br.	....Brahma Purāṇa, or Brāhmna as the case may be.
De.	....N. L. De's Geographical Dictionary of Ancient & Medieval India, 1927.
D.V.	....Dīpavamśa.
E.I.	....Epigraphia Indica.
Gār.	....Gāruḍa Purāṇa.
HV.	....Harivaṁśa.
I.A.	....Indian Antiquary.
IHQ.	....Indian Historical Quarterly.
JBORS.	...Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
JASB.	...Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
JDL.	...Journal of the Department of Letters.
JIH.	...Journal of Indian History, Madras.
KPJ	... Kashi Prasad Jayaswal.
Mārk	... Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.
Mbh	.... Mahābhārata.
Mt	....Matsya Pūrāṇa.
MV	....Mahāvaṁśa
PB	....Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa
Pd.	....Padma Purāṇa.
PHAI	....Political History of the Ancient India, by Hemchandra Raichoudhury, fourth edition.
PT.	....Purāṇa Text of Dynasties of Kali Age.
Rām	....Rāmayāṇa of Vālmīki (Nirṇayasāgara Ed.)

RV	....Ṛgveda.
SBE	....Sacred Books of the East,
Up	....Upaniṣad.
Vā	....Vāyu Purāṇa.
Vṣ.	....Viṣṇu Purāṇa.

CHAPTER I

The Aryans and the Vrātyas

The exact home of the Aryans is yet an open question among the scholars. It is not known for certain as to when and from where the Aryans came to India. An attempt has been made by me in the pages of the *Annals*[1] *of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* to show that the Aryans did not come from abroad. It was from the Punjab that they spread everywhere in India, even beyond it, chiefly to find habitation and it was the excess of population for their evergrowing number.

Puranic accounts go to show that Karuṣa, the sixth son of Manu Vaivasavata, was assigned the eastern territory[2] (in c. 2,700 B. C.[3]) as his kingdom and it would seem that the whole tract east of Kāśī and south of the Ganges upto the sea was once included in the kingdom of the Kāruṣas. This goes to show that south Bihar must have come to exist long before north Bihar.

According to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*[4] the land of Mithilā was full of swamps (srāvitaram). King Nami, the first king of Mithilā, falls in the third generation of Manu and Videgha Māthava or king Mithi follows him. It was king Mithi who undertook the task of emblazoning the land of Videha with the sacrificial fire.

The Aryans on their eastern march of expansion found the Vrātyas who would seem, in all probabilities, to belong to the first band of the Aryans (Kāruṣas ?) who had marched some hundred years earlier to the east before the so-called Vedic

1. Annals of B. O R. I., Poona, Vol. XX. pp. 49—68.
2. Rāmāyaṇa, I. 71.
3. See Vaiśālī genealogy.
4. I. IV. 1. 10.

Aryans. In the Aitareya Āraṇyaka[1] the three people of Vaṅga, Magadha and Cerapāda transgressed the Vedic rite of sacrifice and hence they are called the crows. Does it refer to the Vrātyas ?

Vrātyas

The word Vrātya is found in several passages of Ṛgveda[2] and later[3] in the sense of troops[4] (AV. II. 9. 2.). Vrātya[5] is included in the list of victims at the human sacrifice in the various saṁhitās of the Yajurveda. The Atharvaveda[6] is an idea lisationof the pious vagrant or wandering religious mendicant and the Cūlikopanised reckons the Vrātya as one among the many forms in which Brahman[7] is celebrated. According to the Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa, a Vrātya is a member of a fellowship that stood without the Brāhmanic pale. It is further applied[8] to the son of an uninitiated man or also to[9] one who has let the proper time for the sacrament of initiation slip. The Mahābhārata[10] classes the Vrātya with the offscourings of humanity, e. g., incendiaries, poisoners, pimps, adulterers abortionists, and drunkards. The word vrātya may be derived from either of the words *vrata* (initiated for sacred vows) or *vrāta* (a roving band) for they moved like gipsies in troops.

Vrātyas and Sacrifices

The Vrātyas seem to be non-sacrificers. The only public ceremonies which interested them were certain royal functions

1. II. 1. 1.
2. I. 163. 8 : IX. 14. 2.
3. Atharvaveda, II. 9. 2.
4. The word survives in Marathi *vrātya*, meaning naughty, unmanageable, playing pranks. D. R. Bhandarkara's *Some Aspects of Indian Culture* Madras, 1940, p. 49.
5. Vāj Sam. XXX. 8: Taitt. Br. III. 4. 5. 1.
6. Chapter XV.
7. Cf. *vrātya vā ida agra āsīt.* Paippalāda recension of AV.XV.1.
8. Baudhāyana I. 8. 16. ; Manu. X. 20.
9. Manu X. 39.
10. Mbh. V. 35. 46

which the people were expected to join whether as a member of the *sabhā* or *samiti* or army or of a drinking bout.[1] According to the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa[2] 'when the Devas retired to the upper world called Svarga, some of them, who still wandered about on the earth in the disguise of the Vrātyas, had to remain below. They, longing to join their more fortunate brethren, came to the spot, whence the Devas had ascended to heaven ; but, not knowing the necessary hymn and the metre, were in a fix. The gods sympathising with their less fortunate brethren below asked the Maruts to teach them the necessary hymns with the metre. Thereupon the less fortunate among the gods duly received from the Maruts the necessary hymn called Ṣoḍaśa (the sixteen) with the metre called Anuṣṭubh, by means of which they subsequently ascended to heaven'. There are 4, 6, 2 and 4 hymns for the Hīna (=low) and Garagirs (=swallower of posion), the Nindita (—censured) the Kaniṣtha (=youngest) (who lived from childhood for a limited number of years and were thus denationalised) and the Jyeṣtha (=eldest) respectively. The Vrātya householder who wishes to perform the sacrifice should secure a turban, a whip, a bow, a chariot, a silver coin and 33 cows. His followers should do the same.

The Vrātyas, wishing to perform the sacrifice, should select the most learned or the purest in descent as their Gṛhapati (Chief householder) and they should partake of the sacrificial food after their chief. There should be at least 33 Vrātyas for performing this[3] sacrifice In this way[4] the Vrātyas who deposited their wealth with their old brethren were raised to the rank of Aryans. When such sacrifices were performed, the Vrātyas having secured the rights and privileges of the twice-born might afterwards learn the Vedas, perform sacrifices and make presents to the Brāhmaṇas who may teach them Vedas,

1. A. V. XV. 9.
2. T. B. XVII.
3. Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra VIII. 6.
4. Tāṇḍya B. XVII.

perform sacrifices for them and receive presents at their hands and even dine with them without being required[1] to submit to penance. The great Sixty-one Day Sattra[2] was first performed by Devavrātya with Budha as his Sthapati. It was a group ceremony and a Sthapati was a necessity to represent the group. which might be a family, a tribe, or a whole people even.

Were they Non-Aryans?

It is not known as to what was the Vedic Aryan test for determining the suitability for admission into its fold. In any case it was not the Risleyan anthropometric test. It was not the language even, for though unconsecrated the Vrātyas spoke the tongue of the consecrated. But the term Ārya[3] may be taken to connote *ijyā* (sacrifice), *adhyayana* (studying the Vedas), and *dāna* (offering gifts) which are perhaps very closely connected with the Varṇāśramadharma, i. e., the three high castes have a right to *ijyādhyayanadāna*, but the Brāhmaṇas alone have the right to officiate as priests in sacrifices, to teach the Vedas and to accept presents ; and Brahmacharya is essentially connected with study, the Gārhasthya with the *dāna*, and Vānaprastha with the sacrifices.

Sāyaṇa takes the word *vrātya* in the sense of 'fallen', and in that case the word 'Vrātyastoma' may be translated as 'a prayer for the regeneration of the fallen'. It would seem that these Vrātyas, although they belonged to the first batch of the primitive Aryans, had become almost *anāryas*, having been long separated from them, and since they forgot to follow the cult of sacrifice, study and gift, R. R. Bhagavat[4] would call

1. Lāṭ Ś. Sutra VIII. 6. 29-30.
2. P. B. XXIV. 18.
3. In the Vedas the word Ārya hasbeen used to mean good, master, cultured, guest etc., The Vedic literature did not mean a nation, or a race by the word Ārya. Hence it is not synonymous with the European word Aryan. *Ṛgvsdic Cultnre of the Pre-hisloric Aryans* by Svā mī Śaṁkarānanda, Rāmkrishṇa Vedānta Maṭh, pp. 2—3.
4. JBBRAS. XIX, pp. 356—64.

them non-Āryans. It was their long separation from the Aryan community that accounts for their difficulty in uttering what was easy of utterance. Of course, they had their dress different from the Aryasn. But the Eka-Vrātya drank wine like the other Aryan gods and his various manifestations were Bhava, Śarva, Paśupati, Ugra, Rūdra, Mahādeva and Īśāna—the gods to whom the Vrātyas paid homage. Of course, there are indications in the Purānic literature that the admission of Rūdra in the Vedic pantheon was not very peaceful. Mahādeva's marriage with the eldest daughter of Dakṣa Prajāpati proves unavailing to secure him a place in the orthodox assemblage. Neither he nor his wife is invited to Dakṣa's sacrifice.

All the equipments of a Vrātya were to be given[1] to a Brahmabandhu or to a Brāhmaṇa of Magadha for the simple reason that the Vrātyas were long associated with the country of Magadha. Even at present we find that the Khattris of the Punjab, wherever they may be, would always worship the Sārasvata Brāhmaṇas and would not pay a single pie to a non-Śārasvata Brahmaṇa in gift.

Kinds of Vrātyas.

But the Vedic Aryans were anxious to swell their ranks at any cost, by absorbing even those whose habits differed from them immensely. They invented *stomas* for the purification of the Vrātyas whom they classified into four categories :—

(a) Hīna[2] or the depressed who neither practised the study of the Vedas nor did they plough or trade, but led a nomadic life and who by birth and lineage were outside the Vedic Aryan communion;

(b) Garagirs[3] or swallowers of poison who became outcastes at an early age, probably by living among outcastes, and so they ate the food to be eaten by the Brāhmaṇas, who, though not abused, complained of being abused,

1. A. V. XV.
2. P. B. XVII. 1. 2.
3. Ibid. XVIII. I. 9·

who punished with bats those not deserving punishment, and though unconsecrated spoke the language of the consecreated ;

(c) Nindita[1] or guilty of man-slaughter who had become outcastes for some offence committed and who were cruel ;

(d) Samanīchamedhra. This word has been explained by the authors of the Vedic Index as those old men who being impotent had 'gone to live with outcastes. But this explanation does not seem to be very satisfactory. It seems that the *stoma* was composed to take back to the Vedic fold those Vrātyas who were precluded from sexual intercourse and who had grown old so that the whole family of the Vrātyas including the old and the destitutes may be converted into the Vedic fold.

Purpose of Vrātya Stoma.

Though the Pañchaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa espressely states the object of the *stoma* to be the 'attainment of prosperity', Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sutra[3] says that the ceremony transformed the Vrātyas into Dvijas. When the *stoma* was recorded in the PB., it is possible that the ceremony, for practical purposes, had not become obsolete ; for if it had, the motive for propping it up by the mythology would have been wanting. The mythology, which professes to state how the ceremony originated amongst the gods, was probably intended to give canonical sanction to a practice already becoming suspicious. But by the time the Śūtra-makers came to write on it, the *stoma* had ceased to be a living practice, for it is clear that Lāṭyāyana[4] and other Sūtrakāras could not make out what exactly the things were which the Vrātyadhanas stood for.

1. Ibid. XVII. 2. 2.
2. Ibid. XVII. 4. 1.
3. Lāṭyāyana Ś. S. VIII. 6. 29.
4. Ibid. VIII, 6.

It seems that the first two *stomas* had fallen into desuetude when the Sūtrakāras wrote upon the Vrātyastoma. Consequently they do not understand the difference between one *stoma* and the other. They mix them up in a strange way. Kātyāyana[1] states the purpose of the *stoma* accurately, the first *stoma* being specifically for the Vrātyagaṇa, requires a Gṛhapati for all the four cases. The general effect of all is said to be that they cease to be Vrātyas and become capable of being mingled with. The Vrātyastoma effected mass-conversion of Vrātya groups into Aryan fold and not of individual non-Aryans. The admission of outsiders into the Aryan communion was nothing but a stern political necessity which considered religious and social punctilios and susceptibilities as irrelevancies.

Vrātya Civilisation

The Gṛhapati or the leader of the Vrātyas had a covering for the head, probably to keep the sun off[2]. He carried a whip or a goad (*pratoda*) and a bow without arrow (*jyāhoḍra*—called *gulela* in Hindi and still in use in Magadha amongst children, clay pills serving the purpose of arrows). According to Baudhāyana[3] he was provided with a bow and three arrows in a leather quiver. He used a rough vehicle (*vipatha*--rather a shaky cart of bamboos without cover and drawn by horses[4] or mules, Tāṇḍya Br.), a garment with black fringes, two goat skins : one white and one black. The upper class or the leaders wore turbans and used ornament of silver (*rajato niṣkaḥ*), whereas the lower class[5] were clad in sheep-skins interwoven lengthwise with threads dyed red and used a pair of rhoes. The shoes of the leaders were of variegated black hue and pointed. Once their Gṛhapati was Kūśītaka, the son of Samaśravas.

1. Kātyāyana Ś. S. XXII. 1. 4-28.
2. P. B. XVII. 1.14.
3. Baudhāyana Ś. S. XVIII. 24.
4. Tāṇḍya Bráhmaṇa.
5. P. B. XVIII.1.15.

Luṣākapi[1] the son of Khargala cursed[2] them saying, 'they are fallen off.'

The Vrātyas acknowledged the three grades of the educated, the high born, and the wealthy, for according to Lāṭyāyana[3] he who is superior in education, birth or wealth should be acknowledged as their chief by the 33 Vrātyas who should each have a separate fire for pouring the oblation into.' The ruling Vrātya Rājanyas were a highly cultured race intellectually, but the rest of the population would seem to be sunk in (not poverty, but) general ignorance and superstition.

The Vrātya, even when he is glorified as a Brahmavid or as an Eka-Vrātya is never mentioned otherwise than as being pursued and shadowed by the chattering Māgadha and the pedantic *puṁśchalī* (harlot). The harlot could not have been a part of the Aryan institution for the Ārya has always been an example to others in matters of sexual propriety. Even in the days of the Mahābhārata[4] Magadha is spoken of as a territory of many harlots. Karṇa, the Sūta king of Aṅga, offers *śyāmā* Māgadhī, slave-girls, trained in music and other accomplishments, as reward for services demanded. So the Vrātya Chapter of the Atharvaveda and the Mahābhāra‸ furnish no justification for claiming the *Puṁśchalī* as a Vedic Aryan institution. It is Vrātya, and indigenous in origin. So it would seem that the Vrātyas had attained a very high standard of civilisation.

Their Religion

In matters of faith, the Vrātya was a *free-thinker*. But he believed in ghosts, witches, sorcerers and demons of all descriptions, and the ministration of the priests (Sūtas and Māgadhas[5]

1. Vṛṣākapi (Ṛgveda X. 86. 1 ; 3 : 18) is the son of Indra. Is it probable that Luṣākapi is identical with Vṛṣākapi who cursed the Vrātyas who were non-sacrificers ?

2. PB. XVII. 4.3.

3. Lāṭyāyana Ś. S. VIII. 6.

4. Mbh. Karṇa Parva 38.18.

5. According to the Pṛthu-Vainya legend (Vāyu 62. 138-9) the Sūta and Māgadha sprang up out of Prajāpati's sacrifice held in honour of the First

according to the parts of the country of which they were the natives) consisted chiefly in the pronouncing of set spells and charms and the practising of exorcisms and ordaining elaborate expiatory rites for sins real as well as imagined. The kings and the nobles often held interminable discussions on cosmogonic and theosophic subjects, which they did not impart to the common people, treating them as an esoteric science. The Vrātyas or the Vrātinas, according to Patañjali[1] were republicans, consisting of many tribes. They had unsettled mode of living and were hard workers. The high esoteric religious philosophy of the Rājanyas had to remain esoteric for the simple reason that the rest of the population was intellectually unfit to receive instruction in it. According to N. N. Ghosh[2], 'in the country of Magadha of intensified fecundity and death, the gods that count are the great Vrātya gods, who, as the case may be, originate, preserve or destroy all creatures, Prajāpati, Viṣṇu and Rudra-Iśāna-Mahādeva[3]. Under stress of Upaniṣadic dialectics, the members of the Trinity later lose their individuality and merge in the Ātman-Brahman of the

Consecrated Monarch'. They are specially designed to sing the praises and to act as the bardic repositories of the annals and chronicles of the imperial dynasties founded by Pṛthu. They chronicled similar histories of the Devas, Ṛṣis and eminent people (Vāyu. I. 31 – 2). Thus the Sūta stood to the Purāṇas in about the same relation in which the Brāhmaṇas stood to the Vedas. The Sūta followed a number of inferior professions, e.g., of soldiers, chariot-drivers, and healers of bodily ills (Vāyu. 62. 140). The Sūta is the name of a court official often mentioned with the Grāmaṇī. He, like the Grāmaṇī, is one of the 8 Vīras who sustain the king at his Ekāha-Sattra (PB XIX. 1. 4) and one of the 11 Ratnins figuring in the Rājasūya ceremony (Śatapatha Br. V. 3. 1 5.). In the AV. (III. 5. 7) he is described as a king-maker. In the Taitt. Sam. (IV. 5.2.) the Sūta is spoken of as 'invoilable' (*ahantavya*, which would go to show that he was a Brāhmaṇa. Baladeva, the brother of Kṛṣṇa, had to do penance for killing a Brāhmaṇa - Lomaharṣana. When he was reciting the Purāṇas before the Ṛsis, Balarāmā came there. The assembled sages got up to honour him, but Lomaharṣaṇa, true to his dignity, did not leave his seat. Being enraged Balarāma killed him then and there. The Sūta is a *mahāmati*, just as the Māgadha is a *prājna*. The Sūta never bore messages between the prince and the prince as the European herald did. It was the duty of the Dūta and not of the Sūta.

1. Mahābhāṣya V. 2. 21.
2. The Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture, Calcutta, 1934, pp. 64—5.
3. A. V. XV. 6. 9.

Vedānta. Prajāpati was specifically designated as Brahmā to mark his pre-eminence within the Trinity itself. Popular religion as reflected in the Purāṇas adopted this Brāhma-Viṣṇu-Mahādeva scheme and it has been the cardinal trait of current Hinduism to this day'. Their sectarian mark on the forehead was Lalāma or the Tripuṇḍra of the Śaivas.

The Vrātya Chapter analysed.

The chapter[1] may be divided into 'wo parts: 1—7 and 8—18. The first is systematic and complete and describes the Vrātya as the first God along with his generating accomplishments. The second part is the collection of the different Vrātya traditions, e.g, stanzas 8 and 9 speak of the origin of the Rājanyas ; 10—13 describe the movements of the Vrātya on the earth ; 15—17 speak of the Vrātya inhaling and exhaling as the preserver of the universe ; and the 18th *Paryāya* describes him ast he universal man.

The style of the Vrātya composition was essentially such as found in the fifteenth canto of the Atharvaveda.

There are hymns that do not fit in with the Vedic metre. But there is a clear arrangement of metre and a tendency to fix the words in proportion.

The first sūkta describes the origin of everything. The Ādideva is called a Vrātya. The Vrātyas regarded the pure-souled holy person as the origin and the only cause of all things on the earth. The first God has been designated[2] as the Elder Brāhmaṇa The wandering and actions of the high-soul were the causes of the lively energy. Hence the eternal and best Vrātya was supposed to be the root cause of all things. His movements gave life to the dormant energies of the world. Like the penance and sacrifice of the Brāhmaṇas, the holy actions of the Vrātyas were treated as gods and were taken to be the

1. See Dr. J. W. Hauer's 'Der Vratya': Bhāratīya Anuśīlana (Ojha Commemoration Volume), Hindi Sāhitya Sammelana , Prayag, 1990 V. pp. 13—22.

2. A. V. X. 7. 17.

root cause of the earth. The Vrātya tradition is preserved only in the Sāmaveda or in the Atharvaveda, otherwise the separate existence oft he Vrātya tradition has been uprooted from the Brahmanical literature. The *aprajanita suvarṇa*[1] (the unborn gold) is the indiscernible Pradhāna of the Sāṁkhya, which is the cause of the discernible world. In the first *paryāya* all the references in the traditions connected with the Vrātya are in the neuter gender, and then there is another tradition of the heavenly beings which culminate in the Eka-Vrātya.

2—7 sūktas describe the wanderings and actions of the Universal Man, Eka-Vrātya, in the guise of the worldly Vrātya. The main thing in his wanderings and actions is the Mahāvrata. Another wanderer of the universe—the cause of the universe—is the wind. These sūktas describe in a way the world's creations—rain, corn, and fertility of the soil. In the 14th sūkta the heavenly energies are generated due to the movements of the universal Vrātya.

The second sūkta describes the Vrātya's movements. He moves in the four main quarters. His paths, gods, sāma, and the followers are different in different quarters. The companions and the belongings of the universal Vrātya are the same as those of the worldly ones wandering for religious purposes. The Vrātya moves first to the east and then to the south, west and north. This is the holy *pradakṣnā*. In the 6th sūkta the whole universe is moving along with the Viśvavarātya. He mingles with the flowing greatness (*mahimā sadruḥ*), he becomes the great ocean encircling the world. The Vrātya pervades the corners of the universe like the wind. Wheresoever he goes the natural energies wake up and follow him. It would seem from the second sūkta that the Vrātyas had a spiritual conception of the universe of their own with different worlds in it and with a presiding deity for each ; and they were all under the Eternal Vrātya.

1. A. V. XV. 1. 2.

In the 3rd sūkta the universal Vrātya stands erect for a year. His seat (*āsandī*) is the symbol of the Mahāvrata. The Vrātya as the *udgātā* of the world fills the universe with his chanting of sāmnas and the sounds of Om. All the gods and subjects become his followers and his longings in mind his heralds. The *rajas* comes out of the anādi-Vrātya (*arajyat*) and the Rājanya is born. He becomes the master of the *viśas*, the neighbours (*sabandhūn*), corn, and the enjoyer[1] of the corn. In the 9th sūkta Sabhā (assembly) Samiti (council), senā (army), surā (wine), the great assemblies of these non-Brāhmaṇas and drinking bouts follow him.

In 10—13 sūktas the worldly Vrātya goes to the country and to the house of the Rājanya and of ordinary men as a guest. The wandering guest would seem to be a hermit who was either a priest or a magician (yogin) and a Siddha later on. He was the earthly representatives of the Eka-Vrātya[2]. If he stayed in a house for a night, the house-holder acquired all the holy mansions of the earth ; if for a second day, that of the ether (*antarikaṣ*) ; if for the third day, that of the heaven; if for the fourth, the holy mansions of the holy ; and if for the fifth day, then the unconquered holy mansions. There were some pseudo-Vrātyas[3] (Vrātya-bruvas). But the householder is given to understand that he would get the same advantages as by serving the true Vrātya. In the 12th sūkta the guest does not come in his past splendour along with his companions. Now he is a learned Vrātya whose knowledge has taken the place of his old *karmakāṇḍa*. He is the wandering yogin or Sanyāsin of ancient India.

The 14th sūkta, though elementary, is a repository of esoterism. The energies of the world and the twelve bands of different heavenly existence arise and follow the Vrātya in the twelve quarters. These twelve prepare different eatables and the

1. A. V. XV. 8. 1-2.
2. A. V. XIII. 8. 3.
3. Ibid A. V, XV. 13. 11.

initiated worldly Vrātya partakes with them. To understand the sūkta properly it is necessary to know the quality of cereal according to the ancients. It was a favourite subject of the Vrātya-study. How does the corn transform itself in the form of body and the sustaining energies of mind ? Amongst the eatables what is exactly the thing worth eating ? What is the power that digests it ? It is the beginning of the problem of Prakṛti and Cetana. It raised the question of the grain and its enjoyer and the non-duality of the Pradhāna or Puruṣa. So this fourteenth sūkta is the secret essence of the Vrātya chapter. Its spiritual conception is a grand one. The corners of the universe are pervaded with the generating energy and the spiritual existence of the Vrātya. The universe is one regulated lively body whose soul master is the Eternal Vrātya. The learned Vrātya is his partner in this world.

The Eternal Vrātya inhales in 21 ways and so it would seem that the worldly Vrātya also must be doing some sort of Prāṇāyāma and just as the Eka-Vrātya stood erect for a year the ordinary Vrātya also might be doing the same. It is here that we must seek the seed of Haṭhayoga. The origin of Yoga and the three Guṇas[1] also must be sought here in the Vrātya tradition.

So it would seem that the Vrātya book is not only a political propaganda on behalf of the Eka-Vrātya but it also preaches his theosophic doctrines for the benefit of the Vedic Aryans.

Vedic and Vrātya Religions

The Indo-Aryan literature and culture is a synthetic product. Some of its elements are of non-Aryan, Eastern, Vrātya origin. The Upaniṣads and the Purānas would seem to have been influenced by Vrātya sources whereas the Trayī had a pure Vedic Aryan origin. The synthesis of the two cultures was perhaps first brought about in Magadha. A major portion of

1. A. V. X, 8, 43.

the Atharvaveda seems to have originated in the Vrātya land to serve as a priest's manual for Aryan Brāhmaṇas officiating for Aryanised Vrātya Yajamānas. It is for this reason that the Atharvaveda had to fight long to be included in the list of the Vedas. The Upaniṣads are definitely of the opinion that the desire for Vedic heaven and more so its fulfilment are serious hindrances to the attainment of the Upaniṣadic *summum bonum*, since the enjoyment of material happiness in any degree only creates a desire for more of it, which so long as it remains unfulfilled causes misery and, therefore, the *Brahmavid* counsels that the path to happiness lies in complete renunciation and not in the perpetual hankering after the Vedic heaven.

The Upaniṣadic doctrines, it may be presumed, grew independently and away from all contacts with the Vedic Aryans in the brains of the Vrātya Rajanyas. The Brahmanic literature[1] acknowledges the Kṣatriya's copyright in the basic material of Vedānta. It cannot refer to the Kṣatriyas of the Aryan settlers (*viśas*), for the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas in the Aryan community were not even separate castes in early stages. The statement would refer to the Vrātya Rājanyas of the east who formed a separate order and kept even their bard priests at a respectable distance. In fact, in the domain of ideas, doctrines, and beliefs, the Aryans were converted to Upaniṣadic theosophy and became in turn the missionary preachers of this neo-Aryanism. The Brāhmaṇas versed in the Vedas with *samidhs* in their hands went to the Rājanyas amongst whom the knowledge of these doctrines was originally esoteric.

1, Gita IX, 2,

CHAPTER II

Pre-Mauryan Dynasties

The Gaṇapāṭha[1] of Pāṇini, who is regarded as having flourished in the pre-Mauryan period, mentions Kāruṣas along with the Bhargas, Kekayas, and Kāśmīras. The Ceras are associated with the Vaṅgas and Magadhas in the east in the Aiterayārāṇyaka[2] and they were probably the ancestors of the modern Ceros, just as the modern Kharwars may be associated with the ancient Kāruṣas. The Puṇḍras[3] are mentioned along with the Āndhras, Śabaras and Pulindas as being the outcastes resulting from the refusal of Viśvāmitras 50 sons to accept his adoption of Śunaḥśepa. The authors of the Vedic Index[4] hold that the country of the Puṇḍras corresponds with modern Bengal and Bihar (Chotanagpur ?). This Puṇḍra was probably the hilly region now occupied by the Muṇḍas and their race.

Although Vaiśālī, as such, is nowhere mentioned in the Vedic literature yet one Takṣaka Vaiśāleya is mentioned in the Atharvaveda[5] as the son of Virāja and a descendant of Viśāla, and as the priest at a snake-sacrifice in the Pāncaviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa[6]. One Nābhānediṣṭha, who is known from the Purāṇic sources to have belonged to the royal dynasty of Vaiśālī is the author of the Ṛgveda X 62.

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[7] preserves the legend of Videgha Māthava. King Janaka[8] of Videha figures in the Vedic litera-

1. Pāṇini. IV.1.178.
2. A. A. II.1.1.
3. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII.18. ; Sāṁkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra XV.26
4. Vedic Index 1.536.
5. A. V. VIII.10.29.
6. P. V. XXV.15.3.
7. S. V. 1.4.1.10-7.
8. Śatapatha Br. XI..3.1.2; 6.2.1; 3.1.
   Taitt. Br. II.10.9.9. ; Bṛahadāraṇyaka Up. III.8.2; IV.2.6;9. 30.

ture as a leading patron of *Brahmavidyā*. In the Yajurveda,[1] the cows of Videha seem to be alluded to, although the commentator takes the adjective *Vaidehī* to mean, 'a splendid body' and the point of a place-name in the expression is not very clear.

The name Aṅga occurs only once in the Atharvaveda.[2] In the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa[3], the Aṅgas appear in the compound Aṅga-Magadhāh. Aṅga Vairocana is included in the list of the anointed kings in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[4].

The Magadhas are to be first met with in the Atharvaveda. Bṛhadratha is twice mentioned in the Ṛgveda[5], and the Nandas are twice alluded to in the Lakṣayas of Pāṇini's Sūtras.[6]

So it would appear that although the Pradyotas and the Śiśunāgas are not mentioned in any text of the Pre Mauryan period, we shall be quite justified in tracing the history of the above dynasties with the help of the Purāṇic, Buddhist, Jaina and other late sources for a comprehensive account of the period under consideration. It is none of the duties of the Vedic literature to give the history of the various dynasties that existed in those days, but such references as do occur—are only stray and accidental. It is the Purāṇas and the other sources that should be consulted to give us a connected history, if any, for the period.

CHAPTER III

Vaiśālī Monarchi

We are not in a position to define exactly the ancient boundaries of Vaiśālī which was one of the most powerful kingdoms of India since the dawn of Indian civilisation. However, we

1. Taitt. Sam. II.1.4.5. ; Kāṭhaka Sam. XIV.5.
2. A.V. V. 22.14.
3. G. B. II.9.
4. A. B. VIII.22
5. R.V.I. 36.18.; X. 49.6.
6. Pāṇini II. 4.21.; VI. 2.14.

may say that the boundaries[1] of Vaiśālī are the great Gandak to the west, Burhi Gandak to the east, Ganges, to the south, and the Himālaya to the north. The kingdom of Vaiśālī, therefore, covered a part of the districts of Champaran, Muzaffarpur, and Darbhanga. The Burhi Gandak is, however, extremenly changeable in its course and so the uncertainty of the boundary. It seems to have been bounded on the north and the east by Videha, and on the south by Magadha.

Identification.

Vaiśālī (Vesāla) is the modern Basārh in the Hajipur sub-division of Muzaffarpur district. The ancient city is marked by a large mound of ruins and a magnificent uninscribed pillar surmounted by the figure of a lion.

There were three districts in Vaiśālī. In the first district there were 7,000 houses with golden towers in the middle, in the second district there were 14,000 houses with silver towers, and in the last district there were 21,000 houses with copper towers; in these lived the upper, the middle and the lower classes, according to their positions. Vaiśālī is invariably described in the Dulva as a kind of earthly paradise, with its handsome buildings, its parks and gardens, the singing birds, and continual festivities among the Licchavīs[2].'

The Rāmāyaṇa[3] places Vaiśālī off the southern bank of the Ganges. 'While seated on the northern shore they (the princes of Ayodhyā) saw the town of Vaiśālī. Perhaps the towers of the temples were seen by them from a distance and then they went to the 'charming and heavenly city of Vaiśālī which was a veritable paradise.' The Avadāna Kalpalatā[4] places it on the river Balgumatī.

Genealogy.

No name is given to this dynasty or kingdom at first but king Viśāla is said to have founded Viśālā or Vaiśālī as his

1. Deś Geographical Dictionary of Ancient & Medieval India.
2. Rockhill's Life of Buddha, pp.62-3.
3 Rām.1.45.9-11.
4. A. K. XXXIX.

capital, and thenceforward the kingdom was that of Vaiśālī and the kings were styled Vaiśālaka kings. These names may conveniently be extended retrospectively to include the whole dynasty'.

"Only four Purāṇas[1] viz. Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Garuḍa, and Bhāgavata, give the complete list. The others show various limitations or omissions. The Mārkaṇḍeya narrates the doings of these kings at great length, but only down to Rājyavardhana''. The epics[2] also describe the dynasty partially but none carries the list beyond Pramati—the contemporary of Daśaratha, the king of Ayodhyā, and Sīradhvaja of Videha.

After king Sīradhvaja 30 kings ruled Videha upto the time of the Bhārata war. It has been shown (appendix B) that the war was fought in B. C. 1,867. By calculating backward at the rate of 15 years on the average per king we may assign the extinction of the Vaisālī monarchy in circa. 2,317 (1,867+450 (30×15) B. C. This would lead us to suppose that the dynasty of Vaiśālī was founded in circa 2,827 (2,317+510 (34×15) B.C. for there were 34 kings of Vaiśalī from Nābhānediṣṭha to Pramati

Dynasty

Manu, the first mythical king of India, the son of Vivasvān, had ten sons[3]. Nābhānediṣṭha was assigned the territory of Vaiśālī. According to the Airtareya Brāhmaṇa[4] Nābhānediṣṭha was given to sacred study, his brothers deprived him of his share in the paternal property and referred him to their father who advised him to help the Aṅgirasas in their sacrificial session.

Diṣṭa.

Diṣṭa would correspond with Riṣta of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa[5]. The name is given variously as Nediṣṭa, Diṣṭa and Ariṣṭa. The

1. Va.86.3-12; Viṣ. IV. 1.15-9; Gar. 1.138. 5-13; Bhāg. IX. 2.23-36 Lg.1.66.; Bd. III.61.3-18; Mārk. 109-36.

2. Rām. 1.47.11-7; Mbh. VII. .55.;XII.20;XIV.4. 65-86.

3. Bhāgavata. IX.1.12.

4. A.B. V. 2.14.

5. M.P.112.4.

Harivaṁśa[1] says that his sons though Kṣatriyas became Vaiśyas and this statement is confirmed by the Bhāgavata[2], which says that his son became a Vaiśya due to his actions.

When his son Nābhāga[3] was in the full bloom of youth, he saw a most surprisingly charming Vaiśya maiden. Beholding her the prince was struck with love. He went to her father to ask for her hand in marriage. Her father said: "Nobles of your class are the enjoyers of the earth. We are dependents, paying taxes to you. Why do you earnestly desire connection with us who are not your equals ?" The prince replied," Equality of the human body is wrought by love, folly and other feelings. Bestow your daughter on me, otherwise calamity will befall my body." The Vaiśya said," We are under another's authority and so are you. When your father permits you, you take her away, I will give her." The prince said that elders should not be consulted in love affairs. Thereupon, the Vaiśya himself consulted the king, the prince's father, who sent for the prince in the assembly of the learned Brāhmaṇas.

The question naturally arose as to whether an heir-apparent could legally marry an ordinary girl and whether the progeny of such a marriage could legally ascend the throne, The question was similar to what a British king had to face. The sage Ṛcika, son of Bhṛgu, spoke serenely with the dignity of a conservative premier in the assembly hall, "Marriage is enjoined for princes in the first place with the daughter of one who has been royally anointed."

The prince flung aside altogether the opinion of the high souled sages and going outside he seized her and raising his sword said, "I carry the Vaiśya's daughter Suprabhā by the Rākṣasa form of marriage, let him, who dare, rescue her." The Vaiśya hastened to the king for help. The king, being enraged, commanded his army to slay him but the prince out-

1. Harivaṁśa X.30.
2. Bhāgavata IX.2.23.
3. Mārkaṇḍeya CXIII-CXV.

distanced the army and the king was compelled to go forth in person to rescue her. The father excelled the son in battle. But a sage intervened and stopped the battle and said, "One is allowed to marry a girl first of his own caste and then of a low caste and in that case he is not degraded. But since Nābhāga acted otherwise, he becomes a Vaiśya." Nābhāga complied with the order of the sage and the assembly which passed a similar resolution.

Nābhāga, though reduced to the position of a Vaiśya, was yet a twice-born and entitled to Vedic studies. He continued the theological studies leaving aside the duty of a Kṣatriya. He obtained great wealth in the company of the Añgirasas. His son, on attaining maturity, was helped in getting back royalty by Nīpa of the Aila[1] race who did not always keep good terms with the Ikṣvākus and others of Solar race.

Bhalandana.

He[2] was the son of Nābhāga. When he grew young his mother said to him, "Be a keeper of cattle". He was very much disgusted and went to the royal sage Nīpa of Paurava dynasty, king of Kāmpilya) who had resorted to Mt. Himālaya. He said to Nīpa, "My mother commanded me to be a keeper of cattle; and yet I must protect the earth. This my earth is assailed by powerful heirs. Show me the way."

Nīpa gave him a complete set of weapons. After learning how to handle them, he went to his paternal uncle's sons Vasurāta and others and demanded half the kingdom as befitted his father and grand-father. But they said, "You are a Vaiśyā's son. How can you protect the earth." A battle followed thereafter and after defeating them, he took the kingdom from them.

1. The struggle between Vasiṣṭha and Viśāmitra is well-known. Nahuṣa was on bad terms with Raji of the Alila dynasty. Ahalyā, a princess of the Aila race, came to trouble on account of her marriage with the priest of a Solar dynasty. Bharata, a descendant of the Ailas on his mother's side, was a pawn in the game of politics to oust Rama. It was rather a tradidional enmity that caused the Haihaya. —Tālajangha raids of Kosala.

2. Mārkaṇḍeya P. CXVI

After seizing the kingdom, he presented the earth and its sovereignty to his father who refused to accept it and asked his son to rule, for he had won it as a prize of his valour. Nābhāga's wife pleaded with her husband to accept the kingdom but he declined. Bhalandana became the king and performed many sacrifices.

Vatsaprī.

Vatsaprī[1], the son of Bhalandana, gained Sunandā, the daughter of king Viduratha whose capital was in Mālavā near the river Nirvindhyā[2]. One Kujṛmbha took her by force and Viduratha proclaimed., "Whosoever shall set my daughter free, I will bestow her on him." Viduratha was Vatsaprī's father's fast friend. The prince set out and killed Kujṛmbha after three days' hard fight. He rescued Sunandā and her two brothers who had gone to save her. Eventually Vatsaprī married her and sported with her in charming regions, in palaces and on hill tops.

During his reign, there was no fear of robbers, rogues, or villains or calamities. His wife gave birth to twelve sons—all princes of great parts and victorious in battle.

Prāṁśu.

Prāṁśu[3], the eldest, became the king and others were subordinate to his authority like dependents. At his sacrifice the earth vasundharā (=container of wealth) justified her name, for he gave huge sums to the Brāhmaṇas and others. He possessed rich treasures.

Prajāni

The next king is called Prajāni in Viṣṇu[4] and Pramati in the Bhāgavata[5]. He corresponds with Prasandhi[6] of the Mbh. He was a great fighter and killed many asuras. He had five sons.

1. Mārkaṇḍeya P. CXVI
2. A tributary of the Chambal in Mālavā. It is identified with the Newuj also called Jamrisi. De.p.141.
3. Mārk CXVII
4. Viṣ. P. IV.1
5. Bhāg. P. IX. 2.24.
6. Mbh. Aśvamedha 3.65.

Khanitra

The eldest son of Prajāti became the king. He possessed many noble qualities. His prayer[1], which he offered day and night, might easily excite the envy of a subject-loving benevolent king of any country.

He appointed his four brothers to different kingdoms out of affection, but by so doing, he was put to great difficulties, just as Humayun suffered, as a reward for kind treatment to his brothers. He placed Śauri, Mudāvasu or Udāvasu, Sunaya and Mahāratha in charge of the eastern, southern, western and the northern regions respectively.

Once Viśvavedin,[2] a minister, told Śauri, his master, that Khanitra would have no regard for his descendants and he should rule the kingdom with the help of the ministers who are the instruments of government. Śauri was unwilling to display selfishness against his eldest brother, but the ministers said, "There is no question of the youngest or the eldest. Sovereignty is for men who want it." Śauri was at last prevailed upon. The minister arranged a plot with the help of the other three brothers and their ministers, but his attempts were foiled and the ministers and the priests themselves were ruined. Learning the destruction of the Brāhmaṇas, Khanitra was sorry and aggrieved at heart. He anointed his son Kṣupa to the throne and departed to the forest along with his three wives.

Kṣupa.

This Kṣupa corresponds with the one referred to in the Mbh.[3] where it is said that after the sword was fashioned, Manu gave it to Kṣupa for the protection of the people and Ikṣvāku[4] got it from him. The king was a great sacrificer and administered equal justice to friends and foes. He took one-sixth as tribute. He had a son Vīra from his wife Pramathā.

1. Mārkaṇḍeya P. Ch. 117.12-20.
2. Ibid CXVII and CXVIII
3. Mbh. XII. 166.
4. The insertion of Ikṣvāku is wrong here,

The next king Vīra is called Viṁśa in the Viṣṇu[1] Purāṇa. His dear wife was a Vidarbha princess named Nandinī. His son Viviṁśa is called Viviṁśati in the Viṣṇu. During his rule[1] the earth became densely populated and he met his death in a battle. Thus we find that whenever there is an over population, a war or some natural calamity follows and thus the population is greatly reduced.

Khaninetra.

Viviṁśa's son Khaninetra[2] was a great sacrificer. The monarch, being sonless, went ahunt to obtain flesh for a sacrifice to the manes to get a son. He rode alone in a great forest. There he met a deer who was willing to be killed of her own accord. Being questioned, the deer replied that she did not consider the life worth living without a son. In the meantime there came another deer with the same request for it dwelt in the miseries and anxieties for the many sons and daughters as amid the flames of a raging conflagration. The two deer quarreled among themselves to be killed for sacrifice. Thus the king learnt a lesson from the deer and returned home. He strove to obtain a son without the slaughter of any creature. The king performed severe austerities on the river Gomatī and had a son named Balāśva.

Balāśva or Karandhama.

He was also called, Suvarcas[3], Balāśva or Subalāśva. A king Vibhūti or Ativibhūti is sometimes inserted between Khaninetra and this king. He is famous as Karandhama who is different from another king of the same name who was fourth in descent from Yayāti's son Turvasu.[4]

When he ascended[5] the throne, the other claimants were furious against him. They and the other vassals never paid

1. Viṣ. P. IV.1
2. Mārk. CXIX
3. Mārk P. CXX.
4. Mbh. Aśvamedha 72-79
5. Harivaṁśa 32; Matsya Purāṇa 48.
6. Mārk P. CXXI

him respects or tributes. They rebelled and seized the king's territory. They beseiged him in his own city. The king was in great distress but he gathered courage and working miracles he out-distanced the opponents. According to textual explanation, because from his hands was produced an army which burnt up his foes, he is called Karandhama. Vīryacandra's daughter Virā chose him her husband in a *Svayamvara*.

Avīkṣita.

Avīkṣita,[1] the son of Karandhama, is also called Avīksī. According to the Mbh.[2] he was a great king and ruled at the beginning of the Tretā Yuga with Aṅgiras as his priest, He learned the Vedas along with their branches. He had many wives : Varā, Gaurī, Subhadrā, Līlāvatī, Anibhā, Mānyavatī and Kumudvatī, the daughter of Hemadharma, Sudeva, Valin, Vīra, Vīrabhadra, Bhīma, and Dambha respectively. Those who did not approve of him openly, he took them by force. Once he tried to carry away Vaiśālinī, daughter of the king of Vidiśā. The assembled princes were enraged at this high-handedness and an open fight ensued in which the prince kept the seven hundred[3] warrior princes single-handed at bay, but was at last overpowered and imprisoned.

Hearing the news, Karandhama set out with his army and in three days' hard battle, the king of Vidiśa was defeated. The princess was offered to the prince but he refused to accept her. Her offer being persistently refused, she was compelled to choose a life of austerity in the forest without food and drink. When she was about to die, a sage prevented her not to do so as she would have a son in future.

Avīkṣita's mother[4] induced him to perform the[2] 'Kimicchaka' (= What do you want ?) penance and he declared to bestow on

1. Mārk. P. CXXII
2. Mbh. Aśvamedha. 3.80-5.
3. Mārk P. CXXIII.
4. Ibid CXXIV-CXXVII

any one who asked whatever he wanted. Karandhama was entreated by his ministers to press his son Avīkṣita to forego his penance to beget a son and Avīkṣita promised to comply. While in the forest Avīkṣita found a wicked demon had seized a maiden who called herself his (Avīkṣita's) wife. He killed the demon and was blessed with a son by her who explained to her how she was his wife (being the Vidiśā princess). His son was Marutta. Avīkṣita returned to his father along with his wife and son. Karandhama wanted to go to the forest after giving the kingdom to his son but he refused to accept it as he could not protect himself. So Avīkṣita's son Marutta became the king.

Marutta.

He is famed as an universal monarch and he is one of the famous sixteen kings of antiquity[1]. Traditional verses have been preserved about him, averring that none could possibly equal this ruler in grandeur of sacrifice or generosity to the priests[2]. His name is still sung every morning and evening at the time of mantrapuṣpa (prayer) in an orthodox Hindu family and temples. He was advised by Saṁvarta to acquire gold from the northern parts of Himālaya so that all utensils and all parts of the sacrifice may be prepared of gold. He sacrificed at Uśīravīja on the Himālaya with Saṁvarta of the Aṅgiras family as his priest. Rāvaṇa[3] is alleged to have challenged him to fight or accept defeat. Marutta accepted the challenge but was asked by his priest not to fight without finishing the sacrifice which if incomplete would destroy the whole family. So he applied himself to sacrifices and Rāvaṇa drank the blood of sages there. King Yudhisṭhira is also alleged to perform his horse--sacrifice with the remains of Maruttas sacrifices. Saṁvarta consecrated[4] him with Mahābhiṣeka ceremony and he gave his daughter[5] to

1. Mbh. Aśvamedha 4.23; Droṇa 55.

2. Mark. P. CXXIX.

3. Rámayaṇa VII.18. This raid was perhaps a forerunner of the Āndhra's occupation of the north.

4. Aitrareya Brāhmaṇa VIII. 21.

5. Mbh. XII. 234.

Aṅgiras but more probably to Āṅgirasa i. e., Saṁvarta. During his rule the Nāga[1] troubled the sages grievously and so his grand-mother Vīrā sent him a message to administer justice and secure peace. Marutta visited the hermitage and set the wicked Nāga world on fire. They implored his mother Bhāvinī's (or Vaiśālinī's) protection according to her old promise. She went to Marutta along with her husband. Marutta, insisting on his duty, refused to follow his parents' request. A fight was inevitable, but the sages intervened. The Nāgas restored the dead *ṛṣis to* life and all parted affectionately.

He had many wives[2] : Padmāvatī, Sauvīrī, Sukeśī, Kekayī, Sairandhrī, Vapuṣmatī, and Suśobhanā, daughters of the kings of Vidarbha (Berar, Khandesh, part of Nizam's territory and part of Madhya pradesh), Sauvīra (Upper Sindh, and Multan), Magadha, Madra (the territory between the Ravi and Chenab), Kekaya (the country between the Bias and Sutlej), Sindhu (Sind), and Cedi (Bundelkhand and a part of the Madhya Pradesh) respectively.

There were other less famous kings of the same name e.g. son of Karandhama and fifth in descent from Yayāti's son Turvasu[3]; and Marutta fifth in descent from Śaśavindu[4]. Marutta had 18 sons of whom Nariṣyanta,[5] the eldest, succeeded to the throne and he was followed by Dama.

Dama.

Sumanā[6], the daughter of king Cārukarṇa of Daśārṇa (Eastern Malwa including the kingdom of Bhopal) chose him her husband in a *Svayamvara*. Three other princes, Mahānada of Madra, Saṁkrandana of Vidrabha, and Vapuṣmat tried to take her away by force. Dama, after appealing to the assembled kings against their conduct, was compelled to assert his right by arms, and

1. Mārk. P. CXXX
2. Ibid CXXXI
3. Viṣṇu IV.16
4. Matsya Purāṇa 44.24
5. Mārk. P. CXXXII.
6. Ibid CXXXIII.

returned home triumphant. His father transferred the kingdom to him and retired to the forest along with the queen Indrasenā. The defeated prince Vapuṣmat killed Nariṣyanta—in the forest. Indrasenā sent news to Dama to punish the murderer. Vapuṣmat was killed and Dama celebrated his father's obsequies[2] with his flesh and blood.

Rājyavarddhana.

The Vāyu calls him Rāṣṭravarddhana. There was prosperity all round in his[3] reign. There was no sickness or fear from serpents or droughts. So it seems that his departments of public health and irrigation were highly developed. Māninī, daughter of king Viduratha of the south, was his queen. Once she saw a grey hair and began to weep. The king assembled the citizens and decided to abdicate in favour of his son. The subjects were perturbed. They went to the forest of Guruviśāla in the mountainous region of Kāmarūpa to worship the sun and the king's life was lengthened. But the king was not willing to enjoy the earth when others were to die natural death. He also performed austerities and succeeded in his efforts. King Rājyavarddhana was born to increase his own life as well as of his subjects. It shows his high regards for the subjects who loved him so dearly. He was followed by Sudhṛti, Nara, Kevala Vandhumān, Vegavān, Budha, and Tṛṇavindu.

Tṛṇavindu.

He married Alambuṣā[4], and begot of her three sons: Viśāla, Śūnyabandhu, and Dhūmaketu and a daughter Iḍāviḍā[5] or Ilāvilā who was married to Pulastya, grandfather of Rāvaṇa. Viśālā[6] succeeded Tṛṇavindu and founded the city of Vaiśālī after his name. The last king of the dynasty was Sumati who came

1. Mārk CXXXIV
2. ,, CXXXV and CXXXVI
3. ,, CIX—CX.
4. Garuḍa I. 138. 11; Viṣ IV.1.18; Bhāg. IX.2.31.
5. Mbh. III 89.
6. Vā 86. 15-17; Bḍ III. 61.12 Viṣ. IV. 1. 18. Rām. 1. 47. 12; Bhāg. IX 2. 33.

to an end in circa 2,317 B.C. The kingdom was probably merged into that of Mithilā.

CHAPTER IV

Republic of Licchavis

The word Licchavi is found in varying forms—*Licchivī Lecchavi*, *Lecchai*, and *Nicchavi*. The form *Licchavi* is found invariably in the Pāli canon, but in the Mahāvastu Avadāna[1] the usual form is *Lecchavi* which answers to the Prakrit form 'Lecchai' which occurs in the earliest sacred Jaina literature[2]. The form found in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra[3] is 'Licchivika'. In Manu[4] the anonymous Kāśmirian comment reads 'Licchavī, Medhātithi and Govinda read 'Licchivī', while Kullūka, the Bengali commentator, alone reads 'Nicchivī' a mistake due to the similarity of 'n' and 'l' of Bengali character in XV century A. D. On the coins[5] of Candragupta I the word' Licchavyāḥ', is used in the plural. The form 'Licchavī' is found in various Gupta inscriptions[6]. The other variant' Licchivī' occurs in the Bhitari inscription[7] of Skandagupta. Hiuen Tsang[8] calls the tribe Li-che-po which corresponds with the form 'Ḷicchavī'

Origin.

According to V. A. Smith[9] the custom of exposure of the dead and the judicial procedure[10] of the Licchavīs go to show that they were Tibetans in their origin. But the Licchavīs inherited these custom from their Vedic ancestors whose des-

1 Mahāvastu, edited by E. Senart, pp. 1, 254.

2. S.B.E. XXII. 266; and XLV. part II. p. 321. n. 3.

3. Kauṭilya XI. 1.

4. Manu. X.22.

5. The Age of the Imperial Guptas by R. D. Banerji, B.H.U., 1933, p.4.

6. J. F. Fleet's Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III. pp. 8,27, 43,50, 53.

7. Ibid. p. 256.

8. Buddhist Records of the Western Worlds, by S. Beal, II.73.

9. Indian Antiquary, 1903, p. 233.

10. Proceedings Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1894, p. 5, by S. Das.

cendants they were and these customs are referred to in the Atharvaveda which says,[1] "O Agni ! Bring the buried, and the cast away, those burnt with fire and those exposed, to eat the sacrifice." The custom of burial and exposure on a raised platform is also referred to by the Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra.[2]

As regards the substantial identity of the ancient judicial procedure at Vaiśālī with that of the modern procedure at Lhasa, it may be said that the Tibetans borrowed the procedure along with their religion from the Licchavīs who 'subsequently migrated to or conquered Nepal in the early medieval period' and thence probably to Tibet also. Moreover, very little is known about the state of civilisation in Tibet in the early days of Buddhism and 'this fact should be remembered in instituting a comparison between the Tibeten and the customs of the Licchavīs as reflected in the Pali texts.'

S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa,[3] finding the verbal coincidence between 'Nisibis' in the Persian Empire and 'Nicchivi' in Manu held that the Licchavīs were originally Persians and they came from the city of Nisibis about B. C. 515. It is impossible to identify the Licchavīs with the followers of Darius (516-485 B.C.) for the former were at the height of their glory and culture long before the death of Buddha (B. C. 543). Moreover, there is no tradition or record of their foreign origin in any ancient texts.

Vrātya Kṣatriyas.

Manu says,[4] "from a rājanya Vrātya sprang the Jhalla, Malla, Licchavī, Naṭa, Karaṇa, Khasa, and the Draviḍa." A rājanya[5] is a descendant of a consecrated king, and the Vrātyas, according to Manu[6], are, 'those whom the twice-born beget on wives of equal castes, but who not fulfilling their sacred duties, are excluded

1. A. V. XVIII. 2.34.
2. Āpastamba Ś. S. 1.87.
3. Indian Antiquary, 1908, p. 70
4. Manu. X.22.
5. Amarakoṣa II.8.1 ; II.7.53. Pāṇini IV.1.137 (Rājaśvasurádyat).
6. Manu. X.20.

from the Savitṛ. There is no question that they were not Kṣatriyas by origin, but what is averred about them is that they were not very careful to obey the regulations according to the standard of Manu[1] which he declared to be followed by the people of the world.

We know that Nābhāga and his descendants were declared to be Vaiśyas on account of his wily marriagewith a Vaiśya maiden, who although of a Kṣatriya blood, did not put forth her claim at the time of marriage, but only when the kingdom was offered to her husband by her son Bhalandana who was also not initiated with the ceremonies due to a Kṣatriya being the son of a degraded Kṣatriya with an alleged Vaiśya girl. So from the very beginning of the imperial dynasty, some of the kings were already degraded in the eyes of the Brāhmaṇas as Vrātyas and hence their later descendants were designated as Vrātya Kṣatriyas. Moreover, the Licchavīs were amongst the foremost champions of the non-Brahmanic religions like Jainism and Buddhism. A body of foreigners, esp. unfriendly to the Brāhmaṇic religion, could not have been called even Vrātya Kṣatriyas.

They were Kṣatriyas.

When the Licchavīs of Vaiśālī heard the news of Buddha's passing away at Kusinārā, they sent a messenger to the Mallas saying[2], "The Exalted one was a Kṣatriya and so are we". Mahālī, a Licchavī chief, says,[3] "I am a Kṣatriya, so is the Buddha. If his knowledge increases and he becomes all-knowing, why should it not happen to me." Ceṭaka was the king of Vaiśālī and his sister Triśalā, who is always styled as Kṣatriyānī, was the mother of Lord Mahāvīra. And, therefore, the Licchavīs were Kṣatriyas.

Rockhill[4] refers to Sanang Setsen who says that the Śākya race (to which Buddha belonged) was divided into three parts,

1. Manu II.17.
2. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta VI.24; Dīghanikaya II.p.131 (edited by N. K. Bhagavat) Cf. Bhagavapi khattiyo ahampi khattiyo.
3. Sumangala Vilāsinī 1.312. (P. T.S.).
4. The Life of Buddha and the early History of his Order by W. Woodville Rockhill, London, 1907, p. 203, n. (Popular edition).

whose most celebrated representatives were Śākya the Great (the Buddha), Śākya the Licchavī, and Śākya the mountaineer. Gnya-Khsi-Stan-Po, the first Tibetan king, belonged to the family of Śākya the Licchavī.

When Buddha went to Vaiśālī to avert a plague, he always addressed[1] them 'Vāsiṣṭhas. Maudgalyāyana, being questioned about the probable chances of their victory against Ajātaśatru, said[2]," Men of Vasiṣṭha's race, you will conquer." Mahāvīra's mother[3] Triśalā also 'belonged to the Vasistha gotra'. In the Nepal Vaṁśāval[4] the Licchavīs are assigned to the solar race of Kṣatriyas. So we may say that the Licchavīs were the Kṣatriyas of Vasiṣṭha gotra (i.e. theological school).

The Buddhist commentaries[5] contain a mythical account of their origin. A queen of Banaras gave birth to a lump of flesh and she drifted it in a sealed casket into the Ganges. An ascetic picked it and tended the twins emerged from the casket. Whatever entered the stomachs of the children could be seen as though the stomachs were transparent, so that they appeared skinlesss (nicchavī); some said that the skin was so thin (linācchavī) that the stomach and whatever entered it appeared as though sewn together. When they grew up, the other children disliked them for their quarrelsome disposition and so they were to be avoided (vajjitabba). When they were 16 years old, the villagers obtained land for them from the king, founded a town and married them together. Their country came to be called Vajjī. Their city had to be greatly enlarged and hence its name Vesālī. The myth also shows that they were Kṣatriyas. The word Licchavī defies easy analysis by the ordinary rules of grammar; it was possibly associated with some myth which was invented when the tribe had acquired great power and renown[6].

1. Mahāvastu 1.283.
2. Rockhill p. 97.
3. S.B.E. XXII.193.
4. Indian Antiquary, Vol. 37. pp. 78-90
5. Doctionary of Pali proper Names, by Dr. G. P. Mallalasekera. II, p. 782.; Majjhimanikāyaṭīkā I.258; Khuddakapāṭhaṭīkā pp. 158-60.
6. B. C. Law's *Kṣatriya Clans in Ancient India*, Cal. 1922, p. 21-2.

According to Jayaswal[1] the word Licchavī is derived from Licchu i. e., the descendants of Licchu which in Sanskrit would be Likṣu. Likṣa means a mark and Likṣu is connected with it. The name might have originated on account of some feature-marks.

Vajjīs.

It may be suggested that the Licchavīs are really the Ṛkṣas, of the epics and the Purāṇas, who are essentially a mountainous people inhabiting the Nepal and Tibeten mountains. The word *Ṛkṣa* was easily transformed into Liccha and hence the people of the clan were called Licchaī, Licchavi. The word *Ṛkṣa*[2] means a bear, a fierce animal and formerly it meant any fierce animal *esp.* a lion (=keśarin, same as Vṛjin[3]) which always indicates power. It was for this reason that the Licchavīs adopted a lion, the insignia of their banner, which was later on adopted by the Śiśunāgas and the Guptas. The island of Laṅkā was called Simhala after the lion[4] (Siṁha). We know that Laṅkā was colonised in the past ages during the reign of Tṛṇavindu by the people of Veśālī. The Lāñcchana of Mahāvīra is a lion. All these go to show that the Vṛjīs really belonged to the Ṛkṣa clan. The myth refers to their quarrelsome character. But the Sanskritised form of Varjita would be Varji and not Vṛjī which is generally found. They were called Vṛjins or Vajjīs[5] perhaps on account of their particular mode of dressing the hair. The lion's mane is curly and looks beautiful. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[6] says that the *Prastara* represents the military class and a *Sāyaṇa*[7] explains it as a particular mode of dressing the hair upwards. It would not be strange if the Vajjians of curly hair dressed themselves in a like manner.

1. *Hindu Polity* by K. P. Jayaswal, 1924, Vol. I.p.186.
2. Unadī III.66. Ṛṣati ṛṣi gatau (Snuścikṛtyrṣibhyaḥ kit)
3. Amara. Cf. *Keśépi vrjiṅah.*
4. Dīpavaṁśa IX. 1.
5. Even at present time the Tharus call the Aryan population of Champaran Bajis. JBORS. VI. 261.
6. S. B. 1.3.4.10.; I. 3.3.7. Vedic Koṣa, Lahore, 1926, p. 334.
7. Ibid . Cf. Ūrdhvabaddhakeśasaṁghatmaka.

Republic.

No exact date can be assigned as to when the republic came into existence. But a detailed study of its constitution, which must have taken a long time to develop, indicates that the Vajjian confederation must have been organised after the decline and fall of the royal house of Videha. Had the republic been organised after the fall of Vaiśālī monarchy its president or people must have figured in the Mahābhārata days. Political evolution in India resembles closely the political evolution in the ancient cities of Greece. The right of the king might be strictly limited and the imposition of limitations might go on until the office of the king[1] became a mere show and the real power passed elsewhere. Neither the king nor the people of Vaiśālī are mentioned to have taken any part in the Bhārata War. But the Mallas[2] are mentioned and perhaps they had the upper hand in the territory of Vaiśālī and perhaps a good portion of it was enjoyed by the Videhas. We may place the establishment of the Republic in C. 750 B. C. some two hundred years before the Nirvāṇa of Lord Buddha. It came to an end at the hands of Ajātaśatru in B. C. 525.

The Licchavis formed a great and powerful republic. The supreme power in the state rested with the people or with the officers elected by them, to whom the people delegated sufficient powers to enable them to perform the duties required. Their strength lay in unity and allegiance to the state and regard for the honour of their *members*, institutions and women. The above statement is fully attested by the statement[1] of Buddha who was approached by the 'Chancellor of Magadha' as to the advisibility of invading the Vajjis.

1. PHAI. p.102.
2. Mbh. II.26.20.
3. S. B. E. XI. 3-5; Dighanikāya II.60—1.

Constitution.

The Jātaka[1] calls them 'gaṇa-rulers'. There were three highest officers[2] : Rājā, Uparāja, Senāpati. Another authority[3] adds a Bhāṇḍāgārika (Chancellor of the Exchequer). The rule (rajjam) vested in the inhabitants (vasantānam) 7707 in number. They became Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Commander-in-Chief and Chancellor of the Exchequer by turn[4]. The total population was much larger, divided in outer and inner citiizens 1,68,000 in number[5]. Moreover, 7707 may not be the exact of number of the members of the ruling assembly. It may be an artificially concocted number, seven being used thrice from the idea that it has some magic potency.

In the small republics of the ancient Greek city estates the people usually expressed their preferences directly for many of the most famous Greek estates had an area of a few square miles only. The territory of Vaiśālī was a big one with a large population. It is doubtful if the women, children, the aged and the criminals had a right to vote. Of course, there were no slaves[6]

1. Jātaka IV. 148; 3.
2. Attha-Kathā, Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1838, p. 993.
3. Jātaka 1.504.
4. P. glid.
5. Mahāvastu I. pp.256 and 271.

6. The Greeks assert that slavery was unknown in India--or according to Onesicritus was unknown in the kingdom of Musicanus (Upper Sind or Mauṣikara of Patanjali IV. i.6.) Instead of slaves they employed youths in the flower of their age. Although Manu (VII. 415) enumerates seven kinds, of slaves, it is laid down by him that *no Ārya including the Śūdra* could be enslaved. The slave may purchase his freedom by any earnings acquired irrespective of his master's service, and ransom from outside cannot be refused. Indian slavery must have looked so different to a Greek observer, from the slavery he knew at home, that he did not recognize it for what it was.

The menial work of house life was carried on by slaves and half-breeds who also did most of the village labour and served as petty craftsmen. More skilled workers like chariot-makers were almost of the Aryan rank and not excluded from the society. The agricultural servant was a Śūdra who really did most of the general work in the village and was paid 1/10 of the crop as his labour charges.

The seven kinds of slaves are war-captives, daily-workers for 'food, slaves born in the house, men bought ,given, inherited and those

in India, as affirmed by Megasthenes. Moreover, it is difficult to know if the number 7707 was obtained by direct or represen tative election. But we shall not be far from the truth if we presume that the territory consisted of 7707 families and 1,68,C00 inhabitants giving an arerage of 25 members per family. It is possible that each family elected one man for the general council.

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

There was complete liberty if it means the eager maintenance of the atmosphere in which men have 'the opportunity to be their best slaves'; equality which means the 'absence of special privilege' and 'adequate opportunities open to all'; and fraternity which means a body of men associated for common interest, business or pleasure. "Amongst the Vaiśālians the rule of having respects for the high, the middle ones, the oldest and the eldest is' not observed; every one considers himself to be Rājā' I am the Rājā, I am the Rājā. No one becomes a follower of another[2].'

Rule of Law

The 'rule of law' prevailed in Vaiśālī of those days. It means[3] that no man is punishable except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary legal manner before the ordinary

enslaved for punishment. Even a captive warrior could be enslaved. A slave may become a herdsman or trader if he cannot support himself by service and in fact the farmer population was largely composed of slaves. The slave possessed nothing. His tax was paid in manual labour, for he had no money or other possessions. The Śūdras are especially the slaves of merchants and framers. The slave or servant was an adjunct in all households able to command domestic service, but slaves do not appear to have been kept as a rule either in the house, or as in the west, at mining or plantation work. In the Jātakas, we find, the slave pitted, permitted to learn writing and handicrafts besides his ordinary duties.

The hireling, wage-earner, day-labourer was no man's chattel though his life was sometimes harder than that of the slave. Much work was doubtless done by slaves or by hereditary craftsmen who received customary remuneration from the villagers, and not payment for each piece of work. There was dignity of labour and hence we can say that there was no slavery in India, and there was univarsal suffrage in the republic of Vaiśalī.

1. A Grammar of Polotics, by H. J. Laski, pp. 142, 152—3.

2. Lalitavistara Ch. III.

3. A. V. Dicey's *Introduction to the Study of the Law lof Constitution*, 1939. pp. 168 et. seq.

courts of the land; (ii) that no man is above the law, but every man is subject to the ordinary law of the realm ; (iii) and that the general principles of the constitution are the results of judicial decisions determining the rights of private persons in particular cases brought before the courts. In Vaiśālī a citizen could not be held guilty unless he was considered so by the Senāpati, Uparāja and the Rājā, separately without dissent. A careful record was kept of the decisions of the President on the rolls in which the particulars, of crime and punishment awarded to the citizens found guilty, were entered. There were regular courts of justice and the jury-system (*aṣṭakula*) of trial was also in vogue.[1]

Procedure of Deliberation.

The Buddhist Saṁgha would seem to be copied from the political Saṁgha because the Republic of Vaiśālī had come to exist long before the religion of Buddha and Lord Buddha would naturally adopt the procedure of the political unit for the guidance of his order. An idea of the Republic can be had if we can eliminate the religious modifications of the Buddhist Saṁgha. A proper seat was assigned to every member. The motion (*natti*) was duly moved thrice and only those who did not approve of it were asked to speak. The quorum was strictly observed. A whip was appointed and he undertook to complete the required number. Vote (*chandas*) was free and independent. Voting by ballot was common among them and a careful record of the decisions of the assembly was duly kept. These topics have been fully dealt with by K. P. Jayaswal and I need not dilate upon them.

Right of Citizenship.

The inhabitants were Vṛjis whereas the others were called *Vṛjikas*-[2]a term used by Kauṭilya[3]-who owed allegiance[4] but were

1. Hindu Polity by K. P. Jayaswal, 1924. Cal.
2. Pāṇini IV.2.131.
3. Arthaśastra XI.1.
4. Pāṇini IV.3.95-100

sarontnecesily the inhabitants[1] of the county. The word *Vṛjika* included Vṛjīs and non-Vṛjīs owing a common allegiance.

Marriage Law

The people of Vaiśālī made a law[2] that a daughter born in the first district could marry only in the first district, not in the second or the third; that one born in the middle district could marry in the first and second; but that one born in the last district could marry in any of the three; moreover, no marriage was to be contracted outside Vaiśālī. This would point to the caste prejudices prevalent in the region.

Alliance with Magadha

Cellanā[3], the daughter of Ceṭaka-a Rājā of Vaiśālī, was married to Seniya Bimbisāra. She is also named Śrībhadra[4] and Maddā[5]. In the Buddhist texts she is called Vedehī[6]. Buddhaghoṣa[7] takes the word '*Videha*' to mean 'intellectual effort' (*vedena ihati*). According to him, the other meaning 'of Videha' is inadmissable, for according to the Jātaka[8] Ajātaśatru's mother was a sister of king Prasenajit of Kosala.

Sākala[9], a minister of king Virūdhaka of Videha, came to Vaiśālī with his two sons—Gopal and Siṁha. After a while Sākala was elected a Nāyaka. His two sons married at Vaiśālī. Siṁha had a daughter Vāsavī. After Sākala's death Siṁha was appointed a Nāyaka. Gopāla being slighted went to Rājagṛha where he bacame the first minister of Bimbisara who married Vāsavī, Gopāla's niece, and and as she was of a family from Videha, she was known as Vaidehī. According to Raichodhury[10] 'the designation Vedehi was used in a geographical sense to mean all

1. Pāṇini IV. 3.89-90.
2. Rockhill p.62.
3. S. B. E. XXII, Intro. p. 13.
4. Ibid, p. 13 n.3.
5. The Book of Kindred Sayings 1.38, n. 1.
6. Samyutta Nikāya II. 218.
7. Ibid II. 2. 4-5.
8. Fausboll. III. 121; IV. 342.
9. Rockhill p. 63-4.
10. Political History of Ancient India, (fourth edition), p. 100.

Kṣatriya families of Videha or north Bihar irrespective of their connection with the royal line of Magadha.' The Ācaraṅga Sūtra[1] places the town of Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī in Videha.

Birth of Abhaya.

Ambāpālī was the daughter of Mahānāma a Licchavī chief. According to the law of Vaiśālī, a perfect woman was not allowed to marry but was reserved for the pleasure of the people, and she became a courtesan. Bimbīsara heard of her through Gopāla and although he was at war with the Licchavīs, he went to Vaiśālī to live with her for seven days. Ambāpālī bore him a son who was sent to his father. The boy approached the king fearlessly and so the boy was named Abhaya[2]. According to D. R. Bhandarkar[3] 'this matrimonial alliance (with Vedehī) was a result of the peace concluded after the war between Bimbisāra and the Licchavīs.' It was the dread of Abhaya who had Licchavī blood in him and who was very much liked by the Licchavīs, that induced Ajātaśatru to do away with the Licchavis for if they sided with Abhaya, it would be difficult for him to gain the throne.

Port-Quarrel.

There was a port[4] near the Ganges extending over a league. Half of it belonged to Ajātaśatru and half to the Licchavīs and their orders were obeyed in their respective territories. There was a mine of precious gems at the foot of a mountain not far from it. The Licchavīs[5] took away the gems and thus Ajātaśatru was put to a great loss. The Licchavīs were numerically very strong and so he thought[6] to ruin them ' by sowing the seeds of dissension among them'.

'It cannot be expected that the man whose greed for power and position did override even the natural instinct of regard for

1. S. B. E. XXII. Introduction.
2. Rockhill p. 64.
3. Charmichael Lectures, 1918, p. 74.
4. Vinaya Pitaka I. 228; Udana VIII.6.
5. Divyāvadāna II.522.
6. Anguttara Nikāya II. 35.

his father's life, would show any tender feeling towards his mother's relations. He felt from the very beginning that the Licchavīs formed the greatest obstacle to his realisation of the idea of Magadhan expansion and he resolved to bring the Vajjians to utter ruin'[1].

In course of time the Licchavīs became luxurious. When Ajātaśatru sent Vassakāra to Lord Buddha, the Lord said, "By no other means will the Vajjians be overcome but by propitiating them with tributes or by dissolving the subsisting union.' Ajātaśatru could not propitiate them as that would diminish the number of his elephants and horses and enrich the Vajjians. He decided to break up the union. It was arranged to convene a meeting of the councillors to discuss the Vajjian affairs and Vassakāra would quit the meeting after advocating the cause of the Vajjians, so that he might go to the Licchavīs, Being questioned by the Vajjians he told them why he was so severely punished for so slight an offence. In B. C. 528 he was offered the same high post of a judicial minister which he occupied in Magadha and he soon acquired high repute for his able administration of justice. The youths of Vajjī went to him for training at his hands. By speaking something to one person which had not been said by another person, he succeeded in bringing about a disunion among the rulers in the course of three years so completely that none of them would tread the same road together. When the tocsin was sounded as usual, the Licchavīs disregarded the call saying, "Let the rich and valiant assemble. We are beggars and cowherds."

Vassakāra sent a message to Ajātaśatru to come quickly as that was the proper time, and Ajātaśatru marched with his assembled forces. The tocsin was sounded again and again to check the advance of the Magadhans but they did not heed and

1. Law's Kṣatriya Tribes in Ancient India, P. 130.
2. Samyutta Nikāya, (P.T.S.) II.268.
3. Divyāvadāna II. 522; Majjema Nikāya III. 8.

Ajātaśatru entered the city with wide open gates and came back victorious[1] in B. C. 525.

Ajātaśatru compelled them to accept his suzerainty and pay him revenue. But it seems that they were independent in internal affairs and maintained their forms of government even after their annexation as they are mentioned some two centuries later by Kautilya.

———

1. Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1839, p. 994.

CHAPTER V

Mallas

The Malla country was situated to the west of Videha, and north west of Magadha[1],'including the district of Saran and parts of the Champaran district.[2] Its western boundary would seem to be Vatsa, Kosala and Kapilavastu, and to the north it extended as far as the Himālaya. According to Hiuen Tsiang[3], the territory was on the mountain slopes to the east of the Sākya land and to the north of the Vajian confederation.'

The word 'malla' means a spittoon, cheek, a kind of fish, and powerful. Malla is the name of a tribe and its country. Pāṇini[4] refers to the capital of the Mallas as Mallagrāmaḥ. The country is one of the sixteen Mahājanapadas.[5] The kingdom at the time of Buddha was divided into two parts, having their respective capitals at Pāvā[6] and Kuśinārā.[7] Bhīmsena conquer-

1. Mbh. II, 31.
2. De's Geographical Dictionary, p. 121.
3. Buddhist India. p. 26.
4. Pāṇini VI. 2. 84. See the Lakṣya.
5. Dīghanikāya II. 210. (Rahul's edition, p. 160). It names only twelve and the last four are omitted.
6. It has been identified by Cunningham with Padaraona, an ancient city on the Gandak, 12 miles N.N.E. of Kuśīnagara. Dr. Hoey (J.A.S.B. Vol. 69, p. 80) identified it with Pappaur, 3 miles east of Sivan in Saran District.
7. Kusinārā or Kuśīnagara was situated in Nepal, beyond the first range of hills, at the junction of the eastern Rāpti with the Gandak. (Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition, p. 159). Cunnīngham identified it with the village Kasia-37 miles to the east of Gorakhpur and to the north-east of Bettiah, and this identification seems to be confirmed by the discovery of a copper-plate (JRAS, 1913, p. 152) containing an image of Buddha, bearing the inscription 'Copper-plate in the stūpa of Nirvāṇa'. The plate may be assigned to the fifth century A. C. According to Hiuen Tiang it was 16 yojanas from Vaiśālī and 24 yojanas from Kapilavastu. (Beal, 52n).

ed the lord of Mallas and Kosala on his eastern conquest.[1] It is called the Malla-rāṣṭra in the Mahābhārata.[2] So it would seem that it was already a republic in circa 1,867 B. C. and continued to be so till the time of Kauṭilya[3] in the fourth century B. C.

Monarchy

Like the Licchavis of Vaiśālī, the Mallas also seem to have at first a monarchical constitution. Okkāka[4] (Cf. Ikṣvāku) and Sudassana[5] are mentioned as their previous kings. Okkāka ruled over the kingdom of Mallas from his capital at Kuśāvatī. He had 16,000 queens, of whom the chief was Śilavatī. For a long time, the king had no son and the people became anxious lest the kingdom be seized and destroyed by foreigners. The queen was exposed to the people but her chastity was guarded by Sakka. She gave birth to two sons. The elder prince Kuśa married Prabhāvatī, daughter of a Madda king.

When king Mahāsudassana ruled it, the capital was twelve leagues in length and seven leagues in breadth. The royal city was mighty and prosperous and full of people, crowded with men and provided with all kinds of food. The city was surrounded by seven ramparts of gold, silver, beryl, crystal, agate, coral and all kinds of gems. But in the days of Buddha it was a 'little wattled and daubed town, in the midst of jungle'. Kuśa, the son of Rāma, is alleged to have made Kuśāvatī his capital, and if this Okkāka can be identified with Kuśa (an Ikṣvāku), we may say that the ancient city of Kuśāvatī was founded in circa 2,650 B. C.

Republic

The Mallas of Pāvā and Kuśinārā had their separate Assembly Halls, where all matters, political and religious, were dis-

1. Mbh., II. 26. 20.
2. Mbh, VI. 9. 46.
3. Arthaśāstra XI. 1.
4. Kusa Jātaka (531).
5. Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, Ch. V.

cussed. Ubbāṭaka, a new hall, was built by the Mallas of Pāvā and Buddha was requested to discourse there. Moreover, the Mallas of Pāvā and Kuśīnārā both got their shares of Buddha's remains and so they must be different.

The Mallas formed a league[1] of nine Mallakīs, nine Licchavis and eighteen Gaṇarājas of Kāśī-Kosala to defend themselves from the oppressions of Ajātaśatru who aimed at universal sovereignty. Yet they were defeated and finally annexed to Magadha. The Mallas like the Licchavis were Kṣatriyas of Vasiṣṭha *gotra*.

Although the Mallas and the Licchavis were generally on good terms, there was once a hostility[2] when the Malla Chieftain Bandhula's wife Mallikā longed to enter the lotus tank, used by the princes of Vaiśālī on their coronation, to drink its water to satisfy her pregnancy desire. Bandhula took her to Vaiśālī, drove away the strong guards posted at the lotus tank and let Mallikā enjoy it to her heart's content. The Licchavi kings were informed and they were angry. They pursued Bandhula's chariot and followed on till they were half dead.

CHAPTER VI

Videha

The ancient boundary of Mithilā is nowhere defined. It appears, however, that there were two kingdoms to the north of the Ganges, viz., Vaiśālī and Videha. But the dividing line between them has not been indicated. 'The holy country known by the name of Tīrabhukti is situated between the Ganges and the Himālaya with fifteen rivers in it.' It stretches for 24 yojanas from the Kauśikī on the east to the Gaṇḍakī on the west, and its extent from the Himālaya to the current of the Ganges is 16 yojanas ! Candā Jhā describes the same boundary in Maithilī[3] and the grant of Emperor Akbar to Maheśa Ṭhākura, the first Mahārājādhirāja of Darbhanga, describes the boundary

1. S. B. E. XXII, 266.
2. Bhaddasāla Jātaka (465).
3. History of Tirhut by S. N. Singh, pp. 2,4.

in similar terms[1]. So it comprised the modern districts of Muzaffarpur, Darbhanga, and parts of the districts of Monghyr, Bhagalpur and Purnea, and a great tract of land to the north in Nepal Tarai.

Name

The following twelve names of Mithilā are known : Mithilā, Tairabhukti, Vaidehī, Naimīkānanam[2] (the forest of the descendants of Nimi), Jñānaśīlam-kṛpāpīṭham (the home of knowledge and the centre of grace), Svarṇalāṅgalapaddhati (the footsteps of gold-plough), Jānakī-janmabhūmi (the land of Sītā's birth), Nirapekṣā (having no care), Vikalmaṣā (devoid of sins), Ramānandakuṭī (the cottage of Sītā's pleasure), Viśvabhāvinī (world-pleasant), and Nityamaṅgalā (ever-happy).

The name found in the ancient books is Mithilā and not Tirhut. The origins of words Videha, Mithilā and Janaka are purely mythical[3]. Nimi, the son of Ikṣvāku, instituted a sacrifice that was to last for a thousand years and asked Vasiṣṭha to preside. Vasiṣṭha replied that he had already been engaged by Indra in a sacrifice which would last for 500 years and asked him to wait for the period. Nimi went away and Vasiṣṭha thought that he had agreed and went away. Nimi in the meantime employed Gautama and other ṛṣis for his sacrifice. On the completion of Indra's sacrifice Vasiṣṭha came in all haste to Nimi, but finding Gautama and others employed he cursed Nimi that he should henceforth cease to exist in a corporal form, Nimi cursed Vasiṣṭha in return and both abandoned their human bodies. According to another account[4], he was cursed because he was worshipping his wives while gambling with them. Vasiṣṭha cursed him to be devoid of simon. Nimi's dead body was preserved in oil and scents till the completion of the sacrifice. The sages then agitated his body and a boy came out, who,

1. Cf. Az kosi tā gosi az ganga tā sang.
2. Perhaps once the Videhan territory extended as far as Naimisaranya in the Sitapur district.
3. Rām. I. 48; Vā. IV 5; Bhāg. IX. 13.
4. Matsya Purāṇa, Ch. 55.

on account of his strange birth, was called Janaka, and Videha[1] (one whose body is gone) because his father was bodyless. He is also known as Mithi because of his birth from agitation (*manth*). The word *janaka* has a reference to the tribe —*jana* (Cf. Latin *genus*, Gr. *genos*), and the best or the leader of the *janas* was called Janaka.

According to Pāṇini[2], Mithilā is the town where enemies are crushed. It is cognate with Ayodhyā (that which cannot be conquered, the invincible).

According to the Buddhists[3] Disampati's son Renu divided his kingdom into seven to be shared by himself and six of his friends, the divisions being Dantapur (the ancient kingdom of Kalinga), Potana (Paithan to the north of Godāvarī), Mahissati, Roruka[5] (the capital of Sauvīra), Mithilā, Campā and Vārāṇasī. Mithilā was founded by Mahāgovinda, the steward of king Renu. The above tradition would seem almost an imitation of the Purāṇic division among the sons of Manu.

Tīrabhukti means the province bordering on the banks of rivers (the Ganges, Gandaki, and Kosi). This word truly describes the modern Tirhut with its many interesting rivers. The majority of books were written in Magadha and from their point of view, the portion of Magadha on the other side of the Ganges was a province on the Tīra(bank) of the Ganges.

Some modern writers[4] explain Tirhut as a corruption of Trihutam, i. e., the country of three sacrifices : (a) the sacrifice at the birth of Sītā, (b) *Dhanuṣayajña*, when the celestial bow of Śiva was broken by Rāma, and (c) the sacrifice in honour of the marriage of Rāma and Sītā.

1. The adjective of Videha is Vaideha which means the son of a Vaiśya father and Brāhmaṇī mother, and a trader. We cannot be sure as to how the term Videha or Videhaka was applied to a trader. Perhaps, the people went from different parts of the country to trade in Videha, which was the intellectual as well as commercial centre of India in those days; or perhaps the people of Videha itself went to the different parts of the world for trade like the modern Marwaris.
2. Uṇādi 60.
3. Majjhimanikāya II. 72.
4. History of Tirhut, p. 4.
5. Rohri, a junction on the N. W. Railway.

Dynasty.

This dynasty was descended from Ikṣvāku's son Nemī or Nimi and so it was a branch of the solar race. It was founded in circa. 3,323 B. C. (2,679+644 (23 x 28) for 23 kings are said to have ruled over Mithilā before Sīradhvaja Janaka. After him 29 kings flourished there till the time of the Mbh. war. The Purāṇas[1] agree about the genealogy, except that after Śakuni, the Viṣṇu, Garuḍa, and Bhāgavata insert twelve kings, Arjuna to Upagupta, whom the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa omit, but the former would seem to be right, for there must have been many more kings than the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa have.

'The kings of the dynasty are called Janakas, and this was the family name. The references to Janaka in the text do not, therefore, necessarily mean one and same king, but the name is used there generically, according to the Brāhmanical custom, e. g., the various Vasiṣṭhas and Viśvāmitras are mentioned as merely Vasiṣṭha or Viśvāmitra, and are often confused as one Vasiṣṭha and one Viśvāmitra'. Moreover, the Bhāgavata[2] says, "These kings of Mithilā were well versed in the knowledge of Ātman. By the grace of the lord of Yajñas, these kings though living the family life were still free from the conflict of misery and happiness." So it is erroneous to assume that only one Janaka is meant.

Nimi

There is a king named Nimi—the twelfth son of Ikṣvāku. He was mighty and highly pious. He founded a city Vaijayanta where he settled. He performed a sacrifice as narrated above. The Vedic texts[3] know a king of Videha Namī Sāpya which is the name of a man in the Ṛgveda. Weber thinks that he is mentioned as a priest, but the passage suits a king better, and in the Pañcaviṁśa Brāhmaṇa, he appears as *Namī Sāpya, Vai-*

1. Bd. III. 64. 1-24; Vā. 89. 1-23; Viṣ. Iv. 5. 11-4; Gar. I. 138. 44-58; Bhāg. IX. 13; Rām. I. 71. 3-20; VII. 57..18-20.

2. Bhāg IX. 13.

3. Vedic Index I. 436; ṚV. VI. 20. 6. (Prāvannamī sāpyam); X. 48. 9. (Prame Namī sāpyam); I. 53. 7. (Namyā yadindra sakhyā).

deho rājā, the king of Videha. He was cursed and so he was styled Namī Sāpya, the cursed. The Nimi Jātaka knows a king named Nimi of Mithilā in the Videha country. He was a rebirth of Makhadeva who came down to the world, to bring the number of his families, who renounced the world, up to 84,000. Because the boy was born to round off the family, like the hoop of a chariot, he was called Nemi (hoop). On his father's renunciation, he came to the throne and engaged himself and all his subjects in righteousness and generosity. Once when doubt arose in his mind as to which was more fruitful, holy life or giving alms, Śakra encouraged him to give alms. His fame spread far and wide. Indra sent his own charioteer to fetch him to satisfy the gods' desire to see him. On the way he saw various hells and heavens. He discoursed to the assembled gods and after staying there for seven days he returned to Mithilā to tell his subjects what he had seen. When his barber told him of the appearance of the first white hair on his head, he, like all his predecessors, handed over the throne to his son and became an ascetic. But this Nimi does not appear to be the first ruler of the dynasty, for he appeared in the world when 84,000 princes belonging to the line of Makhadeva had successively ruled.

Mithi

The harbinger of fire-cult was Videgha Māthava—a Videhan prince—probably Mithi. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[1] relates a legend as to how Agni Vaiśvānara went burning from the Sarasvatī towards the east upto the river Sadānirā[2] followed by Māthava and his priest Gautama Rāhugaṇa in circa

1. S. B. I. 4. 1. 10-7.

2. Eggeling identified it with the Gaṇḍaka, but the Mbh. (Bhīṣma IX) places it between Gaṇḍakī and Sarayū and in the list of rivers Sadānīrā is mentioned as a distinct river from the Karatoyā or Gaṇḍaka. Pargiter identified it with the Rāptī a tributary of the Sarayū. De is inclined to identify it with the Karatoyā which flows through the districts of Rangapur and Dinajpur. But the original text (L. 17) is certain that it was the boundary of the Kosalas and Videhas, and so Pargiter is probably nearer the truth.

3,290 B. C. Sāyaṇa takes the hero of the legend to be Videgha, the Māthava or the son of Mathu; Videgha[1], an older form of Videha, is more probably intended, as Weber takes it, for the name of the people and the country corresponding to modern Tirhut. Weber considers Agni Vaiśvānara or Agni, who is common to all men, a personification of the Brahmanical worship and civilisation and the destructive effects of their extension. But this burning through and giving land and water to Agni to taste meant nothing more nor less than performing Vedic *yajñas* by the settlers for themselves'.[2] Perhaps after the death of Nimi the sacrifices had almost become extinct. It was Mithi, or his son, as Sāyaṇa takes it, who was responsible for the re-introduction of sacrificial fire in the Videhan territory. This he accomplished with the help of his family priest Gautama Rāhugaṇa and we already know that a Gautama was the high priest of his father Nimi. Mithi and Mathu are probably derived from the same root—*manth*=to churn.

Neither the Purāṇas nor the Jātakas know of Māthava Videgha as such. According to B. C. Sen,[3] Makhadeva of the Nimi Jātaka may be equated with Mahādeva which may again be converted into Mādhava and so Makha is identical with Mithi. But this equation does not seem to be very probable. Nimi was called Makhadeva possibly because he performed so many sacrifices.

Sītā's Father

As the entire dynasty of the Maithila monarchs was called 'the family of the high-souled Janakas' and all the kings except Nimi bore the title of Janaka, it is very difficult to identify any of these with the great Janaka of the Upaniṣads, the contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya. It is difficult to say[4]

1. Pāṇini VII. 3. 53. (*Nyankādinām ca*) (*vi* + *dih* + *ghañ*).
2. Indo-Aryan Literature & Culture, by N. N. Ghosh, Cal. 1934, p. 172.
3. Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, 1930, Studies in Jātakas, p. 14.
4. P.H.A.I., p. 47.

how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā is correct. The identification seems, however, to have been accepted by Bhavabhūti,[1] who flourished in the VIII century A. C.

It is equally difficult to identify this Janaka with any of the kings of that name mentioned in the Jātakas. H. C. Raychaudhuri is[2] tempted to identify the Vedic Janaka with Mahājanaka I of the Jātaka. But the Jātaka[3] gives no information as regards Mahājanaka I, the only point mentioned about him is that he was the father of two sons, Ariṭṭha Janaka and Polajanaka. On the other hand Mahājanaka II is a towering and luminous personality, clear-cut historical figure, having had a unique career in his early years, but in the latter part of his life exhibiting a great spirit of renunciation. Though the Purāṇic and epic accounts do not supply any information of histotorical value regarding the early life of Janaka, yet the Brahmanical literature, by representing him as a philosopher of high repute, shows a good deal of kinship with the Jātaka tradition regarding the transformation of his character and outlook which occurred towards the close of his life and so Dr. B. C. Sen[4] identifies Janaka with Mahājanaka II—a view entertained by Rhys Davids[5] also.

'Janaka was truly the Janaka—father of his subjects. This particular scion of the Ikṣvāku family was very strictly religious. If he or one of his immediate descendants won by his piety the title of *Videha* in the strictly theosophical sense of the term, there is nothing to be wondered at. Videha makes the nearest approach to the modern *jīvanmukta*. In ancient time monasticism and royal dignity went hand in hand in the person of many kings'.[6] The title won by one of the sovereigns was adopted by his successors just as the English Kings use upto this

1. Mahāvīracarita II. 43; Uttararāmacarita IV. 9.
2. PHAI, p. 48.
3. Mahājanaka Jātaka (No. 539).
4. Journal of Department of Letters, 1930, 'Studies in Jātakas', p. 13.
5. Buddhist India, p. 26.
6. MM. Dr. Ganganatha Jha Commemoration Volume, Mithila, by Sita Ram, pp. 377-88.

date the title *Defender of Faith*—formerly won by Henry VIII. At least one of them, the Janaka Videha of the Upaniṣaḍ, with his teacher Yājñavalkya has been immortalised as the first enunciator of the principle of Vedānta—afterwards consolidated by Bādarāyaṇa.

Sīradhvaja

King Hrṣvaroman[1] had two sons : Sīradhvaja and Kuśadhvaja. After the death of the father, Sīradhvaja came to the throne and the younger brother was entrusted to his care. After sometime Sudhanvan, the king of Sāṅkāśya[2] invaded Mithilā. He sent news that the bow of Śiva and his daughter Sitā should be handed over to him. This being refused, there was a great fight in which Sudhanvan was defeated and slain. Sīradhvaja installed his brother Kuśadhvaja on the throne of Sāṅkāśya. The Bhāgavata confuses the genealogy here and says that Kuśadhvaja was the son of Sīradhvaja, although the Rāmāyaṇa, Viṣṇu and Vāyu attest that he was the brother of Sāradhvaja and hence the Bhāgavata account may be rejected.

Sīradhvaja—the plough-bannered—gave his daughter Sītā to Rāma as a prize of his valour, and his brother's daughter was given to Làkṣmaṇa.[3] Two other daughters of Kuśadhvaja[4] were given to Bharata and Śatrughna.

Rāma's Route to Mithilā

The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki gives certain clues[5] which enable us to trace the route followed by Rāma in the company of Viśvāmitra from Ayodhyā to Siddhāśrama and from the hermitage to the capital of Videha.

1. Rām. I. 71. 16-20; I. 70. 2-3.

2. It has been identified with Sankisa or Basantpur situated on the northern bank of the river Ikṣumatī or Kālinadī in Etah district. De, p. 177.

3. Rām. I. 71. 21-22.

4. Ibid, I. 72. 11.

5. Educational Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India, by Dr. S.C. Sarkar, 1928, pp. 118-20.

When Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa fully equipped with arms followed the hermit and walked half a yojana on the southern shore of the Sarayū, they drank the sweet water of the river and there 'spent the night in sweet content on the Sarayū's pleasant bank'.[1] On the second day after finishing the bathing rites and prayer they started and reached the holy river having three pathways[2] and saw the sacred hermitage of Kāma on the beautiful confluence of the Sarayū and Ganges.[3] They spent a night there with a pure stream on each hand so that they might cross the river (Ganges) on the next day.

On the third early morning the princes followed the hermit to the river-shore where the high-souled men had stationed a pretty barge with careful consideration. The sage crossed the rivers attended by the two mighty princes and reached the southern shore of the Ganges. They passed gaily on their journey and a little space[4] beyond they saw the gloomy awe-inspiring forest[5] like some vast cloud that touches the sky, full of wild birds and beasts. Here they killed Tāṭakā, the wife of Sunda, and stayed for the night happily in the forest where she was killed. Here we have reminiscences of Caritravana, Rāmarekhāghāṭ, and Viśrāmaghāṭ where Rāma landed after crossing the rivers. From there they proceeded to Siddhāśrama which was perhaps not very far from modern Buxar.

The suggestion[6] that the Siddhāśrama is very likely the site of present Sasaram which may have been derived from this Siddhāśrama through a colloquial form 'Sijhasram' does not seem to be probable in view of the fact that Vāmanāśrama was not far from the confluence of the Sarayū and the Ganges on the southern side of it. The *āśrama* area was a block of woodland abounding in monkeys, deer and birds. It was certainly not near a hill. So it could not have been near Sasaram

1. Rāmāyaṇa I. 22. (Nirṇayasāgara edition).
2. See my article 'Śrī Gangājī', Mahāvidyā, May-June, 1936, Kāśī.
3. Rām. I. 23.
4. Rām. I. 22. 26. (North-Western Recension).
5. Cf. Rām. I. 24. (*Vanaṁ ghorasaṁkāśam*).
6. Sarkar, p. 119.

but most probably it was somewhere near Dumraon which is not very far from Buxar. The whole of the Shahabad district in ancient times was a big forest land. The confluence of the Sarayū, now near Chapra, was formerly near Ballia, north of Buxar and even at present a tributary of the river flows into the Ganges there. The lapse of centuries has shifted the course.

They stayed in the Siddhāśrama guarding the inroads of Marica and Subāhu—the chiefs of the Malada (ya or ja) and Karuṣa, keeping awake for six days and nights[1] and they killed the latter whereas the former fled towards the south on the eleventh day since their start. They started from the Siddhāśrama along with a hundred carriages and 'when they travelled for eight or ten hours from the *āśrama* a distance of about 36 miles, they halted on Śoṇa's distant shore while the sun was going to his evening rest. When the sage was telling tales to the princes it was almost past midnight and the moon[2] was rising forth, so perhaps it was the eighth day of a dark fortnight.

On the next day by the noon they reached the hermit-haunted flood[3] of the Ganges which was at a distance of three yojanas from their halt on the Śoṇa. They did not cross the Śoṇa there because it was deep[4] and full of many isles there in its bosom. The time did not permit them to cross the river in the daylight and so they rested on the bank of the holy river Ganges. It is clear, according to a distinguished Orientalist[5] that they were following a cross-country or trade route. It was somewhere east to the subsequent confluence of the rivers Ganges and Śoṇa near Pāṭaliputra that they landed on boats with decks comfortably carpeted[6] and canopied or they smoothly crossed over the rapid and wide river, more formidable in those days

1. Rām. I. 30. 5.
2. Rām. I. 34. 17.
3. Ibid. I. 32. 10.
4. Ibid. I. 32. 5. (North-Western Recension).
5. Sirkar, p. 119.
6. Rām. I. 45. 6. Cf. *Sukhāstīrṇa* or *Sukhātīrṇā* or *Sūvistīrṇā*.

than it is now. While sitting on the bank of Ganges[1], they saw the big capital of Vaiśālī.[2] It was here that they received the hospitality of Sumati, the king of Vaiśālī, and on the fifteenth day they set out on their onward journey from the territory of Vaiśālī. They proceeded to the city of Mithilā, the capital of Videha, and halted on the way at the ancient suburban *āśrama* of Gautama of Āṅgirasa family. Here Rāma emancipated Ahalyā, the cursed wife of the sage, at a place subsequently known as Ahiyārī[3], and they reached Yajñavāṭa, the place of sacrifice, the same day.

Janaka the king of Videha invited them to the *yajña*, and here Viśvāmitra told the king that the princes were anxious to see the bow. Janaka ordered his servants to bring it from the city which they did in an iron box with great difficulty.[4] It is evident, therefore, that the bow was broken in the Yajñavāṭa which was at some distance from the city. It is believed that the bow was broken at Dhanukhā, 14 miles from Janakapur, in the Nepal territory, where a bow lying over a pond in the wilderness still preserves the record of the memorable exploit.

The bow was broken on the sixteenth day, and messengers, who were sent immediately on very swift conveyances, reached Ayodhyā in three days[5]. King Daśaratha started the next day along with his party and reached Mithilā. The marriage was celebrated with due ceremonies on the twenty-fifth day since the start of Rāma from Ayodhyā. Viśvāmitra went to the Himālaya for penances and the marriage party returned to the royal capital of Kosala. 'As the royal cortege were proceeding homewards through the districts of Muzaffarpur, Saran and Gorakhpur, they met Paraśurāma whose traditional residence is in the neighbourhood of Salimpur in Gorakhpur district.'[6]

1. Ibid, North-Western recension.
2. According to the N.-W. recension they went to Vaiśālī proper. Cf. Rām I. 41. 10.
3. Near Kamtol Station of the O.T.R. on the Janakapur Road.
4. Rām. I. 67. 4.
5. Ibid I. 68. 1.
6. Linguistic and Oriental Essays by R. N. G. Cust, London, 1880, p.74.

The marriage of Rāma is still celebrated annually by the Vaiṣṇavas all over India on the fifth day of the bright Mārgaśīrṣa and so it is presumable that Rāma started from Ayodhyā on the Kārtika Śukla tenth and the whole affair was finished in less than a month. Thus the statement of an Indologist[1] that Rāma was married when he was sixteen or seventeen years of age should be accepted with reservation. Rāma was only 15 years old[2] when he started from the capital and his marriage was over in less than a month. His calculation would seem to be in excess by a year or two. Rāma's marriage was celebrated in C. 2,679 B.C.

Story of Ahalyā.

The earliest reference to the story[3] of Ahalyā occurs in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[4] where Indra is called 'the paramour of Ahalyā'. While explaining the above epithet, the Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa[5] clearly says that Indra was the paramour of Ahalyā Maitreyī. A similar reference is found in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa[6], but no details are given in any of the *Brāhmaṇas* about the story.

In the Rāmāyaṇa[7], we find the reference to a hermitage of a certain Śaradvant of the Āṅgirasa family, husband of Ahalyā (a sister[8] to king Divodāsa of North Pāñcāla) in the outskirts of Mithilā in a garden where she was rescued by Rāma of solar dynasty. Here we have a detailed version of the story which has undergone transformations in later literature. The story was most probably modified later by the devotees of Viṣṇu to show his greatness, particularly in contrast with the still popular Vedic god Indra.

1. Sarkar, p. 58.
2. Rām. I. 20. 2.
3. Evolution of the Myth of Ahalyā and Maitreyī by D. Verma, in Jha Commemoration Volume, pp. 429-32.
4. Ṣaḍ. B. III. 3. 4. 18.
5. Ṣaḍ. Br. I. 1.
6. Jimi. Br. II. 79.
7. Rām. I. 41-9.
8. AIHT. pp. 116 & 222; Mbh. I. 130.

Kumārilabhaṭṭa[1] (VIII century A. C.) suggests that the sun, because of its great splendour, is called Indra, while the night is called Ahalyā, for it disappears during the day-time. Indra in the form of the sun makes the night (*ahalyā*) disappear, and hence he has been given the epithet Ahalyā-jāra and not because of any illicit connection with another's wife'. Suggestions like this are, in my humble opinion, later attempts to explain away cases of social aberrations in the Vedic age. Similar attempts were made by Svāmī Dayānanda in the last century to explain many such statements. In fact, it has been a practice in all ages and countries to explain away references in sacred literature to incidents objectionable from subsequent points of view.

But the probability is that Ahalyā, being of an Aila stock and married to a priest of solar dynasty could not naturally reconcile herself to her new household circumstances which led to her separation from her husband and it was left for Rāma to bring an union between the two. The Pāṇḍavas[2] visited the lake of Ahalyā on their pilgrimage and so the story would seem to be based on a historical fact in the hoary past.

Burning of Mithilā[3]

The earliest mention of King Janaka is in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[4] But the famous passage which is frequently repeated in later texts is contained in XI. 6.2.1. where king Janaka of Videha is said to have met once some travelling Brāhmaṇas—Śvetaketu Āruṇeya, Somaśuṣma Śatayajñī, and Yājñavalkya, and asked them how they offered the *agnihotra* oblation. They replied in different ways and the king was satisfied with the answer of Yājñavalkya and he gave him a hundred cows.

1. Tantra Vārtika I. 3. 7.
2. Mbh. III. 82. 109.
3. Proceedings of the First Oriental Conference, Poona, 1927, pp. 115-24, by C. V. Rajwade.
4. S. B. III. 1. 1; IV. 1. 1; 2. 1.; 4. 7; V. 14. 8; XI. 3. 1. 2.; 4. 3. 20; 6. 2. 1.

The Kauśītakī Brāhmaṇa[1] and the Bṛhadjābāla[2] Upaniṣad have merely passing references to him. But almost the whole of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Ch. IV speak of his philosophical discussions mainly with Yājñavalkya.

In the Mbh[3]. there is a very large number of narratives about him. But a tone of respectable distance is already visible in them and sometimes he becomes almost mythical. The verse :

Susukaṁ bata Jīvāmi yasya me nāstikiñcana
Mithilāyāṁ pradīptāyāṁ na me dahyati kiñcana

is many times abruptly ushered in as having been formerly sung by the king of Videha. King Janaka is also said to have employed a hundred teachers of various sects and tried to find out the soul. Pañcaśikha comes at last and he preaches the Sāṁkhya doctrine to the king. When Janaka was to renounce the world, his wife said[4], "Abandoning wealth, children, friends, many kinds of jewels, and the path of sacrificial fire, you are begging a handful of rice.... Leaving aside your splendour of wealth, you expect to fill your belly like a dog. Your mother has become sonless and your wife Kausalyā without a husband." She pleaded with her husband to lead a worldly life and distribute gifts for that was the best *dharma* and renunciation was of no use.

King Janaka is mentioned in the Jātakas only. But in the Dhammapada[5] a *gāthā* resembles the famous stanza :

We who have nothing of our own may live without a care
or sigh,
Feasting on joy in perfect bliss like an Ābhassāra deity.

In the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the Dhammapada, there is an additional verse given preceding this *gāthā*, which appears as an exact translation of the famous stanza in the Mbh. Accor-

1. K. B. IV. 1.
2. B. U. VII. 4. 5.
3. Mbh. II. 36; XII. 311. 19.
4. Mbh. XII. 318. 4 & 12.
5. Dhammapada XV. 4.

ding to the Mahājanaka Jātaka. once the king went to a park. There were two mango trees, one laden with fruits and the other without any. He plucked a fruit from the former and began to eat it. His retinue, thereupon, ransacked that tree and left no fruit on it. On his way back the king reflected that the tree was ruined on account of its fruit, while the other was quite safe. Thus in the world, only those that have possessions are beset with fears. So the king resolved to renounce the world. He left the palace just when the queen was coming to see him. Knowing what had happened, she followed the king, and in order to tempt him back to the worldly life, she showed him fire and smoke on every side and said, "Here are the flames that are burning down all your treasures. Come back, king. May not your wealth be destroyed". The king replied :

> We who have nothing of our own may live without a care or sigh
> Mithilā's palace may burn, but naught of mine is burnt thereby.

The queen then tried to win him over by various devices in vain. The king went to the forest and later the queen also renounced the world.

The accounts of Namī are given in the commentaries to and the text of the Uttarādhyayana[1] Sūtra, Namīpravrajyā. Namī seems to correspond with king Nimi of the Brahmanical and Buddhist books. The commentary gives the introductory account of the life of Namī upto the point where the text of the chapter begins.

Once there reigned a king Maṇiratha in the Mālavaka country. His brother's wife was Madanarekhā with whom he fell in love. But she would not consent and, therefore, he got her husband killed. She fled to a forest where she gave birth to a male child. While bathing she was carried away by a Vidyādhara. The king of Mithilā found the child and brought

1. S. B. E. XLV. pp. 35. ff, chapter IX.

him up with the help of his wife. Later on Madanarekhā reached Mithilā and was named Suvratā. Her son was named Namī. Maṇiratha died of serpent-bite, just the night he killed his brother. So Candrayaśas came to the throne of Mālavā. Once the white elephant of Namī was wandering in the town and was caught by Candrayaśas whence war followed. But Suvratā revealed her identity to Namī and made peace between the two brothers. Candrayaśas then abdicated in favour of Namī. Once there was an intense burning sensation in the body of king Nami. The queens anointed him with sandal juice, but their bangles jingled which troubled the king much. So they broke all their bangles, leaving only one on each arm, when all noise stopped. From this the king realised that Saṁgha was the cause of all pains in this world and he renounced it.

Here the text of the Sūtra begins. When king Namī was to renounce the world, there was a great commotion in Mithilā. To test him Śakra came in the disguise of a Brāhmaṇa to delude the king.

Śakra :—'Here is fire and wind, your palace is being burnt; why do you not look at your seraglio ? (Śakra shows him the ravages done by fire ánd wind)'

Namī.—'Since I have nothing, I live and I live happily; with the burning of Mithila, nothing burns of mine. There followed a long conversation in which Śakra was defeated in his arguments by the king who was quite determined to renounce Śakra at last bowed to the king and went away.

So it is clear that the burning of Mithilā is not a historical fact. In the Mbh. and the Jātaka it is the queen who tries to tempt the king back into the worldly life, but in the Jaina account it is Śakra who comes to test him. From the agreement in names in the Mbh. and the Jātaka, it may be said that the Jainas substituted Namī, one of the Janaka's ancestors for Janaka himself. All the accounts go to show that the kings of Mithilā did not care much for worldly pleasures and afterwards realised the Brahman.

Ariṣṭajanaka.

This Ariṣṭajanaka may be identified[1] with Ariṣṭanemī. He was the elder of the two sons of Mahājanaka I, king of Videha. During the life-time of his father he was employed as a viceroy-Uparāja, and on his death he ascended the throne. He was killed by his younger brother Polajanaka who was the commander-in-chief. The widowed queen fled from the kingdom and lived as a sister with a Brāhmaṇa scholar at Kālacampā where she gave birth to Ariṭṭha's posthumous son Mahājanaka II.

Mahājanaka II.

After finishing his education, Mahājanaka[2], a young man of 16, sailed for Suvarṇabhūmi on a commercial enterprise to get sufficient money wherewith to recover the kingdom of Mithilā. The ship perished in the middle of the ocean. He managed to reach Mithilā, where the throne had been lying vacant since the death of Polajanaka, his uncle, who had left a marriageable daughter and no son. Mahājanaka was married to the Princess and raised to the throne. He was a very popular king but acting under a great religious impulse he renounced the world notwithstanding the most earnest entreaties of his devoted wife Sivaladevī and the whole people. The king was exhorted to lead a virtuous life by two ascetics, Nārada Kassapa and Migajina. After his retirement prince Dighāvu, his son, became the king of Videha.

Aṅgati.

He[3] was a righteous Kṣatriya king of Videha ruling at Mithilā. He had a daughter named Rujā and three ministers—Vijaya, Sunāma, and Alāṭa. Once he paid a visit to Guṇa of Kassapa family, an ascetic and scholar of great celebrity. The king imbibed heretical views from him. His daughter Rujā tried in vain to prove the worthlessness of the ascetic's teach-

1. J. D. L. 1930, Studies in Jātakas, by B. C. Sen, p. 137.
2. Ibid, pp. 155-6.; Mahājanaka Jātaka.
3. Ibid, pp. 135-6; Mahānāradakassapa Jātaka.

ings. Nārada Kassapa came and succeeded in winning him back to the right path.

Suruci.

Suruci, the king of Videha, had a son who was named Suruci. He had a palace 100 storeys high, all of emerald. The son and grandson of Suruci also bore the same name. The son of Suruci I, while a prince, contracted friendship with Brahmadatta of Benaras at Takkasilā where they had both gone for education. Later on, when Suruci was on the throne of Videha and Brahmadatta on that of Benaras, this friendship of early days was strengthened by a matrimonial alliance. Prince Suruci III, son of the reigning king, Suruci II, married Sumedhā, the princess of Benaras. Out of this wedlock was born Mahāpanāda[1] and there was a great jubilation at his birth in both the cities.

Sādhīna.

He was a very pious king and so great was his merit that Śakra took him to his heaven where he lived for many (700) years. He came back to the world of men and found Nārada reigning in Videha. He was offered the throne, but he refused. He distributed charities for seven days and thereafter passed to the next world.[2]

The kings like Mahājanaka, Aṅgati, Suruci, Sādhīna and Nārada are not mentioned by the Purāṇas whereas they are found in the Jātakas only, which do not mention the other (and more important according to the Purāṇic chroniclers) kings of Mithilā. The reason is to be sought in the biased views of the sectarian writers who tried to extol the faith and dogma of their own religions. Moreover, the Purāṇas promise to give us the names of only the important kings. Perhaps the Buddhists drew their kings from some source, other than the Purāṇas, now lost to us.

1. Mahāpanadā and Suruci Jātakas; JDL, 1930, B. C. Sen, p. 157.
2. Sādhina Jātaka; JDL, 1930, B. C. Sen, p. 158.

Kalāra.

Nimi's[1] son, Kalāra Janaka, is said to have brought his line to an end. This king would seem to be identical with Karāla Janaka of the Mbh.[2] According to Kauṭilya[3] 'Bhoja, known as Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden, perished along with his kingdom and relations; so also Karāla the Vaideha'. The Jayamaṅgalā commentary[4] of Bhikṣu Prabhamati further explains that the king Karāla on his pilgrimage to Yogeśvara, seeing the crowd with curiosity, glanced a young and beautiful wife of a Brāhmaṇa, and being struck with love, he took her forcibly to the city. The Brāhmaṇa went to the city crying angrily as follows : 'why does that town not crack where such an evil soul resides;' consequently the earth cracked and the king perished in it along with his whole family. This account is confirmed by Aśvaghoṣa[5] who says, "And so Karāla Janaka, when he carried off the Brāhmaṇa's daughter, incurred loss of caste thereby, but he would not give up his love."

Pargiter[6] identifies Kṛti with Kṛtakṣaṇa[7] who attended the Śabhā of Yudhiṣṭhira. But this identification does not seem to be very reasonable. There were Janakas even after Yudhiṣṭhira, for 28 kings ruled in Mithilā from the time of the Bhārata war up to the time Mahāpadma Nanda i.e., from B. C. 1867 to B. C. 366 for 1501 years giving an average of some 54 years. But this number 28, of kings, may be much more, as the Purāṇas promise to give us only the list of famous kings; and Virudhaka, a king of Videha is mentioned by Rockhill[8] as an early contemporary of Bimbisāra, and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa says that with Kṛti ended the family of the Janakas. It is desirable to identify Karāla or Kalāra with Kṛti of the Purāṇas and not

1. Makhadeva Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya II, 32; Nimi Jātaka.
2. Mbh. XII. 302. 7.
3. Arthaśāstra I. 6.
4. Sanskrit Samjīvana Patrikā I. 27, Patna, 1940,
5. Buddhacarita IV. 80.
6. AIHT. p. 149.
7. Mbh. II. 4. 33.
8. Rockhill p. 63.

with Kṛtakṣaṇa of the Mbh. The objection that Kalāra is the son of Nimi and not of Bahulāśva, may be met with on the only supposition that the title Nimi may have been borne by several kings of the dynasty and Bahulāśva may have been one of them.

The people of Kāśī had a share in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy'.[1] Even in the time of Great Janaka of the Upaniṣad, Ajātaśatru, the king of Kāśī, could hardly conceal his jealousy of the Videhan king's fame. The passage[2] 'as a terrible son either of the king of Kāsī, or of the king of Videha, presents himself before the enemy, having stringed his bow slackened before, taking two arrows in hand—the arrows that have pointed iron-heads and that are capable of piercing right through the gear of the enemy, probably refers to frequent struggle between the kings of Kāśī and Videha. The Mbh.[3] refers to an old story of a great battle between Pratardaṅa—son of Divodāsa[4]—king of Kāśī and Janaka, the king of Mithilā. The Vajjis are said to be descendants[5] of Kāśī. 'This would probably indicate that a junior branch of the royal family of Kāśī established itself in Videha.'[6] The Sāṁkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra[7] mentions another Vaideha king, Para Ahlāra.

Videhas in Bhārata War.

Amongst those who fought for Duryodhana against the Pāṇḍavas in the Great Indian War, there is a Rājā called Ksemadhūrti. S. N. Singh[8] takes him to be the Rājā of Mithilā, described as Kṣemāri in the Viṣṇu and as Kṣemadhī in the Bhāgavata, but the Mbh., knows him as the king of the Kalutas.[9] Pāṇḍu, the father of the Pāṇḍavas, had already conquered

1. PHAI. p. 69.
2. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III, 8, 2.
3. Mbh. XII. 99. 1-2.
4. Mbh. XII. 30; Rām. VII. 48. 15.
5. Paramātha Jātaka I. 158-65).
6. PHAI. p. 72.
7. S. Ś. S. XVI. 9. 11.
8. History of Tirhut, Calcutta, 1922, p. 17.
9. Mhb. VIII. 5.

Mithilā[1] and Bhīmasena[2] also fought and subdued the Rājas of Mithilā and Nepāl. So the kings of Mithilā were already the vassals of the Pāṇḍavas and they would be naturally expected to side with them.

Yājñavalkya.

The word *yājñavalkya*[3] means 'one who promulgates sacrifices'. According to the Mbh.[4] and the Viṣṇu[5], Yājñavalkya was a disciple of Vaiśampāyana who himself was a pupil of Vyāsa. He was forced to give up what he had learnt and when it was picked by others it was called the Taittirīya Yajus. Yājñavalkya worshipped the sun who communicated to him the Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā. According to others Yājñavalkya's father Brahmarāta was a Kulapati who supported innumerable Brāhmaṇas and others with food and hence his name Vājasāni. It may be expounded as 'one whose gift is corn' (*Vājo annaṁ sāniḥ dānṁyasya*). Yājñavalkya is called Vājasaneya being his son. He studied the Vedānta under Uddālaka Āruṇi who once said[6] to him, "Even a stump would put forth branches and leaves, if water impregnated with Vedantic power were thrown on it". A story is fabricated[7] in the Skanda Purāṇa on this statement and Yājñavalkya is represented to have worked out this miracle.

He was a great philosopher and a good debator. Once king[8] Janaka of Videha commenced a great sacrifice with great gifts. There came Brāhmaṇas from distant countries like Kuru-Pañcāla. He sought to know who was the wisest amongst those Brāhmaṇas. He tethered a thousand cows with ten *pādas* (quarter Tolas) of gold-covered horns. He said to them that whosoever was par-excellence in the knowledge of Brahma

1. Mbh. I. 113. 28; II. 29.
2. Mbh. II. 30.
3. Pāṇini IV. 2. 104.
4. Mbh. XII. 360.
5. Viṣṇu. III. 5.
6. Bṛhad. Up. 7.
7. Skanda Purāṇa Nāgarakhaṇḍa Ch. 129.
8. Śatapatha Br. X. 6. 2. 1.

would take away those cows. The other Brāhmaṇas did not dare. Then Yājñavalkya asked his student Sāmaśrava to loosen the cows which he did. The other Brāhmaṇas became angry. When he was asked as to why he took away the cows without expounding the Brahman, he merely saluted the Brāhmaṇas and said that he was really fond of cows. Later he defeated all the other scholars : Jaratkārava, Çakrāyaṇa, Khaḍḍa, Gārgi, Uddālaka, Sākalya and others assembled there and became the precepter of the king.

Yājñavalkya had two wives[1] : Maitreyī and Kātyāyani. Maitreyī had no child. When he was to depart to the forest, she requested him to tell her that which might make her immortal. Thereupon, he expounded her his Brahmavidyā[2]. He is known as the author of the Yajñavalkya Smṛti which is probably based on his liberal teachings. He is called Yogīśvara and he appears to be a social reformer for his laws are much more humane than those of the Manu. He advocated the eating[3] of flesh of cows and oxen provided it was tender. He had a son[4] named Nāciketas. A large banyan tree at Jagban (Yogivana) near the Kamtol station of O.T. Railway is adored as his hermitage.

From all this information, Yājñavalkya may be looked upon as a historical[5] personality 'King Hiraṇyanābha[6] of the Ikṣvāku dynasty (3rd in Pargiter's list) is described as a great Yogīśvara and a keen student of Vedic rites. Yājñavalkya studied Yoga under him. Hiraṇyanābha Kausalya as the *Hotā* of king Atnāra[7] and as the proposer of some mystic questions to Sukeśa Bhāradvāja[8] would ap-

1. Ibid. XIV. 7. 3. 1.
2. Bṛhad. Up. IV. 5. 1.
3. Sātapatha Br. III. 1. 2. 21.
4. Taittirīya Br. III. 11. 8. 14.
5. *The Spiritual Interpretation of Yājñavalkya Tradition*, Indian Historical Quarterly, 1937, pp. 260-78 by A K. Coōmarswamā, may be consulted for unhistorical mentality of scholars.
6. Viṣṇu IV. 4. 48.
7. Sāṁkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVI. 9. 13.
8. Praśna Up. VI. 1.

pear to be the same person.[1] There is also another tradition recorded in the Mbh[2], and the Rāmāyana[3] that Bṛhadratha Janaka, the son of Devarāta, (17th in Pargiter's list) who flourished before Sīradhvaja, asked certain mystic questions to Yājñavalkya—the best among the sages, who narrated how he acquired the Yajus from the sun, and how he composed the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[4]. This would place Yājñavalkya and the composition of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in the hoary past. But it may be pointed out that Bālhika—the son of Pratīpa and the brother of Śantanu, is referred to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[5] The Viṣṇu Purāṇa[6] says that Śatānīka, the son and successors of Janamejaya, learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya. The Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad[7] refers to the Pārīkṣitas ; and the Mbh.[8] says that Uddālaka, a prominent figure in Janaka's court attended the snake sacrifice of king Janamejaya along with his son Śvetaketu. In view of so many conflicting statements, we cannot arrive at any definite conclusion as to when Yājñavalkya flourished. The scholars sometimes forget that these are mere *gotra* (theological school) names and sometimes the *gotra* was changed by disciple-ship or parentage, just as a girl's gotra is changed at the time of her marriage. S.N. Pradhan has brought about a great confusion in his '*Chronology of Ancient India*' by identifying the teachers and kings simply on the similarity of names. It is well known that all these works were compiled for the first time by Vyāsa about the time of the Bhārata War (B.C. 1,867), and they were in a floating condition prior to that. However, we may roughly assign Yājñavalkya to circa 2,580 B. C. if he is supposed to be a contemporary of Bṛhadratha, the son of Devarāta.

1, Dr. A. S. Altekar's Presidential Address to the Archaic Section Calcutta, 1939, p. 13.
2. Mbh. XII. 315. 3-4.
3. Rām. I. 71. 6.
4. Mbh. XII. 323.
5. S. B. XI.I I. 3. 3.
6. Viṣṇu p. IV. 4. 48.
7. B. U. III. 3 1.
8. Mbh. I. 53. 7.

Scholars of Mithilā.

'No other part of India can boast of an unbroken tradition of scholars from the hoary age of the Vedas. It is only here that from the time of Janaka down to the present day a continuous stream of scholarship has been flowing in the land[1].' Gautama, Kapila, Vibhāṇḍaka, Śatānanda and Ṛṣya Śṛṅga are some of the outstanding scholars of Mithilā in the past.

The hermitage[2] of Ṛṣya Śṛnga is supposed to be at Ṛṣi-kuṇḍa, 4 miles to the N.W. of Bariarpur, a station on E.I. Railway. The proximity of Ṛṣi-Kuṇḍa to the Ganges afforded facility to the public women sent by Romapāda, king of Aṅga, to entice away the young hermit from his seclusion. According to the Mbh.[3] his hermitage was situated not far from the river Kauśikī and it was at a distance of three yojanas from Campā where the houses of the public women were situated. 'Śāntā, Rāma's elder sister adopted by Romapāda, was secretly married to Ṛṣya Śṛṅga and referred to in the Kosalan court.' The scholars of Mithilā were so renowned that even king Daśaratha invited Ṛṣya Śṛṅga of a Kāśyapa school in the Kauśikī valley to perform the sacrifice[4] for a son and to be the master of the ceremonies.

'Vedavatī was the daughter of Kuśadhvaja and a niece of Sīradhvaja. Kuśadhvaja, while yet a prince, became a Vedic teacher and gave the name Vedavatī to his daughter who also grew to be a veritable embodiment of Vedic learning. Kuśadhvaja wished to make her a bride of Viṣṇu (Cf. the brides of Christ). She refused all her suitors—oneof whom was a chieftain Śumbha who was murdered in his bed at night by Kuśadhvaja. Rāvaṇa in the course of a victorious raid[5] along N.E. India came

1. Some Unknown Sanskrit Poets of Mithilā, by H. D. Sharma, in Jha Cammemoration Vol. p. 359.
2. De, p. 169.
3. Mbh. Vana Parva 110.
4. Rām. I. 9. 5; I. 10.
5. Rāvaṇa was a descendant of Vaiśālī from the mother side. Rāvaṇa seems to have claimed the portion of his share of Vaiśālī as being their grandson, and hence his raid over the north Bihar and the Himālayan territory.

to her *āśrama*[1] and he was hospitably received by Vedavatī. She answered all his enquiries, but being rather indecently accosted, she protested. Rāvaṇa, however, attempted violence successfully, whereupon she mortified herself[2], and died.

So it would seem that even female education was widely prevalent in Mithilā of those days and women attained a very high standard of education in secular as well as spiritual field and they could discuss philosophy with learned sages.

CHAPTER VII

Aṅga

The name Aṅga first occurs in the Atharvaveda.[3] The Aryan chiefs[4] Arṇa and Citraratha were overthrown by Indra on the bank of the Sarayū in favour of a devotee of his own. Citraratha's father Dharmaratha drank Soma along with Indra (i.e. offered Soma sacrifice to Indra) at Gayā on the Viṣnupada mountain[5] and Kālañjara.[6] The Mbh.[7] mentions Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one kingdom. Viṭankapura, a city of Aṅga, was situated on the seashore[8]. It is, therefore, clear that Dharmaratha and his son Citraratha were holding sway over eastern U.P., and Bihar and the river Sarayū flowed in their kingdom, and to the east it reached the Bay of Bengal. Its northern boundary has always been the Ganges[9] except perhaps the Kosi valley which was sometimes included in the Videhan territory as the Rāmāyaṇa suggests and to the south it stretched as far as the borders of the sea ; i.e. from[10] Vaidyanātha to Bhuvaneśvara in Puri district. [10]De thinks that if Vaidyanātha be the northern limit, it will exclude Campā, the capital of Aṅga, situated far to the north of Vaidyanātha. He conjectures that

1. Rāmāyaṇa VII. 17
2. Sirkar, pp. 79-80.
3. A. V. V. 22. 14.
4. R. V. IV. 31. 18.
5. Vāyu. 99. 102.
6. Brahma P. 13. 39.
7. Mbh. II. 44. 9.
8. Kathāsaritsāgara XXV. 35; XXVI. 115; LXXXIII. 3-16.
9. B. C. Law's Geography of Early Buddhism, 1931, p. 6.
10. Śaktisangama Tantra Ch. VII.

Bhuvaneśa is a mislection for Bhuvaneśī—another name of Kirīṭeśvarī—whose temple is situated in Murshidabad district. De's conjecture cannot be entertained for Kaliṅga was included in the Aṅga territory and the Tantra describes the boundary of Aṅga from one temple of Śiva to another. It was one of the Mahājanapadas. According to others,[1] Aṅga included the districts of Manbhum, Birbhum, and Murshidabad and it also included the Santhal Parganas.

Name.

According to the Rāmāyaṇa,[2] Madana fled from the hermitage of Śiva to escape his consuming anger and the region, where he cast off his body (*āṅga*), has since been known by the name of Aṅga. The hermitage of Mahādeva also has been known as Kāmāśrama. This Kāmāśrama was situated at the confluence of the Sarayū and the Ganges. Local tradition[3] points out to Karon as the place where Mahādeva performed penance. There is a temple of Kāmeśvaranātha at Karon in Ballia district, opposite Buxar, across the Ganges. The Mbh.[4] and the Purāṇas[5], say that Balī had *kṣetraja* sons who founded the kingdoms after their names. Hiuen Tsang also confirms the Purāṇic tradition. He says,[6] "At the beginning of this *kalpa*, when men were homeless savages, a goddess came down from heaven, and after bathing in the Ganges, became pregnant. She bore four sons who divided the world among them, and built cities, and the first city was Campā." According to the Buddhists[7], Aṅgas—the chieftains of Aṅga, were so-called because of the beauty of their limbs.

1. N. L. De, p. 7.
2. Rām. I. 32.
3. Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1914, pp. 317-47. 'Notes on Ancient Aṅga' by N. L. De.
4. Mbh, I. 104.
5. Vś. IV. 18; Mt. 48. 25; Bhāg. IX. 25.
6. On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, by Thomas Watters, London, 1905, Vol. II. 181,
7. Dīghanikāya Commentary I. 279.

The Mbh.[1] describes the people of Aṅga as *sujāti* or of noble birth, but in later times journeys to Aṅga, Vaṅga Kaliṅga, Saurāṣṭra and Magadha are interdicted[2] 'except for religious purposes'.

Capital.

All authorities are agreed that Campa was the Capital of Aṅga. But the Kathāsaritsāgara[3] says that it was Viṭaṅkapura situated on the sea-shore. Campā is said to have been founded by king Campa who named it so in circa 2,040 B. C., its ancient name was Mālinī.[4] In the Jātakas[5] it is called Kāla-Campā, probably in contradiction to Campā of the snow-clad Himālaya—the state of Camba or Campā on the borders of Kāśmīra. Its present name is Champānagara, situated near Bhagalpur. It gradually became celebrated as an emporium of commerce on account of its situation on the Ganges. At the time of Buddha's death, it was one of the six great cities[6] of India, the others being Rājagṛha, Śrāvastī, Sāketa, Kosāmbī and Benares. It increased in wealth, and traders sailed from this port to Suvarṇabhūmi[7] (Lower Burma, Malaya, and Sumātrā). The emigrants from this city were responsible for naming[8] and establishing the great settlement of the same name in the Indo-Chinese Peninsula.

The celebrity of the capital became so great that its name superseded that of the country. Hiuen Tsang called it Chen-po (Campā). It was situated on the bank of the river

1. Mbh. II. 52.
2. S. B. E. XIV, Prāyaścit Khaṇḍa I. 2. 13-4.
3. K. S. S. I. 25; II. 82.
4. Vāyu 99. 105.
5. Mahājanaka Jātaka Vidhura Paṇḍita Jātaka.
6. Mahāpārinibbān Sutta V.
7. Mahājanaka Jātaka.
8. Indian Antiquary of VI. 229. Cf. Mahācīna-Mongolia; Mahākosala; Magna-Graecia-South Italy; Magna Graecīa in Asia-Bactria; Mahācampā-Greater Campā or colonial Campā like Nova Scotia or New England or like Great Britain or Greater Britain. The Tamil form of Campā in south India is Sambai'. But it is also written Campā in the compound name Camāpati, the goddess of Campā. The name is, of course, borrowed from the north Indian name like so many others and is not of Tamil formation. I owe this information to the late Dh. S. K. Aiyangar of Madras.

Campa, and there was a grove of Campaka[1] trees near a lake, and the Mbh.[2] also says that Campā was surrounded with Campaka trees. The Ubbaī Sutta[3] of the Jainas gives the following description of Campā at the time of Koṇika who is mentioned there as its king. It was then thickly populated and was in a flourishing condition. It was quite a picturesque town with its Śṛṅgāṭaka (junction of three roads),[4] Cauka (squares),[5] Cacchara (court-yards),[6] Caumuka (platforms for seats),[7] Ceyīya (temples) tanks and avenues of fragrant trees on the road sides.

Dynastic History.

Titikṣu,[8] the younger son of Mahāmanas, founded a new kingdom in the east i. e. in east Bihar in circa 2,567{1867 + 700 (25x28)} B.C.. King Balī was a great ascetic and he had a golden quiver. Dīrghatamas begot six *kṣetraja* sons from the wife of Balī named Sudeṣṇā.[9] They were Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Suhma, Puṇḍra, and Āndhra. These sons established principalities after their names. Balī established the four castes and his sons followed the tradition. Marutta, the king of Vaiśālī, and Duṣyanta, the husband of Śakuntalā, were his contemporaries,[10] for Dīrghatamas in his old age consecrated Bharata,[11] the son of Duṣyanta, and Saṁvarta, the cousin of Dīrghatamas officiated as the high priest of Marutta. Dīrghatamas is a Vedic Ṛṣi and an author of Ṛgveda (I. 140-64).

Marutta[12] in his old age was defeated by Māndhātā who defeated king Aṅga and many others. Dīrghatamas was long-lived Sāmkhayāna Āraṇyaka[13] asserts.

1. Papancasūdanī, Majjhima Nikāya Ṭīkā II. 565.
2. Mbh. III. 82. 133; V. 6; XIII. 42.
3. Quoted by De (JASB. 1914).
4-7. For Diagram please see Chapter XI.
8. Bḍ. III. 74. 24-103; Vā. 99. 24-119; Br. 13. 27-49; Hv. 31; Mt. 48. 21-108; Vṣ. IV. 18- 1-7; Ag. 276- 80-6; Gār. 139. 68-74; Bhāg. IX. 23. 4-14; Mbh. XIII. 42.
9. Bhāg. IX. 23. 5; Mbh. I. 104; XII.
10. AIHT. p. 163.
11. Ait. Br. VIII. 23.
12. Mbh. XII 28-88.
13. S. A. II. 17).

King Daśaratha of Aṅga was known as Lomapāda[1] (hairy-foot). He averted the calamity of a dreadful drought and consequent famine by performing a sacrifice presided over by Ṛṣi Śṛṅga[2]. His other contemporaries were Sīradhvaja of Videha, Pramati of Vaiśālī, and Aśvapati of Kekaya[3] (between the Bias and Sutlej). The Lomakassapa Jātaka agrees[4] substantially with the epic story of Romapāda, king of Aṅga. The point of discrepancy is that in the Jātaka version Lomakassapa, the great ascetic, over-came his passion while the sacrifice was in progress and went away without marrying Candāvatī, daughter of a Brahmadatta of Benares. Pālakāpya Muni, the author of a treatise on elephants (*Hastyāyurveda*) flourished at the time of Romapāda,[5] king of Campā, and he has been referred to as a 'Sūtrakāra'.[6]

The great-grandson of Campa was Bṛhanmanas, whose son was Jayadratha, who by a wife who was the daughter of a Kṣatriya father and a Brāhmaṇī mother, had a son named Vijaya. This led the Paurāṇikas to call the dynasty that of a Sūta.[7]

King Adhiratha found Karṇa in a basket (kāṣṭha-pañjara) on the bank of the Ganges, where he had been exposed by his mother Pṛthā. Since Karṇa was not a king of the Kṣatriya aristocracy, being a Sūta of Aṅga by adoption, Arjuna would not fight with him. Duryodhana acknowledged him the king of Aṅga although the Pāṇḍavas were unwilling to recognise it. Karṇa was killed in the Bhārata battle and was succeeded by his son Vṛṣasena, who was followed by Pṛthusena. We have no connected account of the kings of Aṅga after the Bhārata war.

A king Dadhivāhana of Campā is said[8] to have fought with Śatānīka of Kauśāmbī. Śrī Harṣa[9] speaks of a king of Aṅga

1. Matsya 48. 95.
2. Rām. 9.
3. Rām. II. 12.
4. JDL. 1930, 'Studies in Jātakas' by Sen.
5. Nakula's Aśvacikitsitam, Ch. 2; JASB, 1914.
6. Raghuvaṁśa (Mallīnātha's comment)) V. 26.
7a. Cf, Manu X. II.
8. Wilson's Viṣṇu P. IV. 24.
9. Priyadarśikā IV.

named 'Dṛḍhavarman being restored to his kingdom by Udayana of Kauśāmbī

End of Aṅga.

Brahmadatta, king of Aṅga, defeated Bhaṭṭiya—Kṣatraujas or Kṣemavit of the Purāṇas[1]—king of Magadha. But when his son Ṣenīya (Bimbisāra), then a prince, grew up, he invaded Aṅga, killed Brahmadatta, and took his capital Campā with the help of a Nāga king,[2] (probably of Jhārakhaṇḍa). Bimbisara granted some lands in Campā as a royal fief to a Brāhmaṇa named Śoṇadaṇḍa.[3] Brahmadatta was the last independent sovereign of Aṅga and it never recovered its lost independence ; but remained subject to Magadha and it became a part and parcel of Magadha for all practical purposes. It was governed in the beginning as a separate province under a governor with Campā as its capital. When Bimbisāra ascended the throne, his son Ajātaśatru became governor of Aṅga. He plundered the people to such an extent that they were obilged to complain to the king.[4] Ajātaśatru penalised his brothers Hāla and Vehālla, who fled from Campā and took refuge in the court of their maternal grand-father Ceṭaka at Vaiśālī. On Ceṭaka's refusal to surrender them, Ajātaśatru led an army against him from Campā and killed him in a battle. His two brothers escaped and took refuge in the holy order of Mahāvīra.[5]

Jainism in Aṅga

Campā is a stronghold of the Jainas. The twelfth Tīrthaṅkara Vāsupūjya lived and died at Campā. Mahāvīra spent here three rainy seasons and two at Bhaḍḍiyā.[6] Candanabālā,

1. De. JASB. 1914, p. 321. Bhattiya, according to the Buddhists, was the father of Bimbisāra. Kṣemavit of the Purāṇas was followed by Bimbisarara and hence the identification.
2. Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka.
3. Mahāvagga I. 19; V. 1.
4. Rockhill, p. 90.
5. Jacobi : Jaina Sutras, Introduction, pp. 12-4.
6. Kalpasūtra p. 264.

the daughter of Dadhivāhana, was the first female to embrace Jainism shortly after Mahāvīra attained the Kevaliship in 556 B.C.

Rise of Buddhism.

Buddha made frequent excursions to Campā and resided on the bank of the Gaggara lake which was excavated by the queen Gaggarā.[1] Buddha went to Aṅga from Śrāvastī at the instance of Subhadrā, a daughter of the celebrated Anāthapiṇḍaka, who was married there in a family devoted to Jainism. The whole family was converted and Buddha went away after leaving Aniruddha to complete the work of conversion in that country.[2] Mudgalaputra or Maudagalya—a disciple of Buddha—converted Śrutaviṁśatikoṭī, or rich merchant of Modāgiri (Monghyr) into Buddhism.[3] Buddha resided at Bhadelia or Bhadaria—8 miles to the south of Bhagalpur—for three months and converted Bhaddāji, son of a very rich merchant.[4] It was the birth-place of the celebrated Viśākhā who became the chief of the lay disciples of Buddha. She was the daughter of Dhanañjaya and grand-daughter of Meṇḍaka, both of whom were treasurers to the king of Aṅga.[5]

CHAPTER VIII.

Kikaṭa.

Kīkaṭa was the name by which ancient Magadha was known to the Ṛgveda which says;[6] "What do the cattle do for you among the Kīkaṭas, they yield no milk with the Soma, they need not the vessel (for libation), bring them to us ; (bring also) the wealth of the son of the usurer (Pramaganda) and give us, Maghavan (the possession) of the low-branch.". Kīkaṭa was a much wider area than Magadha which was

1. Rockhill p. 70.
2. Kern : Manual of Buddhism, pp. 37-8.
3. Beal : II. 186.
4. Mahāpanāda Jātaka (II. 229); Mahāvagga V. 8; VI. 34.
5. Mahāvagga VI. 12, 13, 34, 50.
6. RV. III, 53. 14.

included in the territory of Kīkaṭa[1]. According to the Śaktisaṅgama Tantra[2], the Kīkaṭa territory extended from Caraṇādri (Chunar in Mirzapur district) to Gṛddhrakūṭa.

Yāska[3] holds that Kīkaṭa is the name of a non-Aryan country, but Weber[4] holds Rightly that the people were located in Magadha and they were Aryan though at variance with the other Aryan tribes, perhaps because of their heretical tendencies.[5] H.P. Śāstrī[6] thinks that it was somewhere near Hariyānā in the Ambala division of the Punjab. In fact, there were many cows, and Soma[7] grew in plenty in the land of the Kīkaṭas and still they did not observe the Soma cult and hence the apathy of their neighbours who were jealous of winning their lands so fertile.

Magadha

According to J. C. Ghosh,[8] Maganda and Magadha mean the same thing, with the only difference that in the case of Magadha the root √ *dhā* has been used instead of √*dā*. Pramaganda, therefore, means the province of Magadha.[9] Maganda can also be derived as *mā* (=light) √*gam* (to go) with the Uṇādi affix *dan* meaning 'from where proceeds the light'. Thus it is a synonym of Udanta or Udyanta.

The word Magadha means a beggar, full of sins, a knower, a medicine; and the word Māgadha means a bard, a mixed caste of a Vaisya's father and a Kṣatriyā[10] mother and the white cumin.

1. Kīkaṭa in Ṛksaṁhitā—its Identification and Archaeological Importance, by K Chaṭṭopādhyāya, Woolner Volume, p. 41.
2. As Qvoted in Śabdakalpadruma.
3. Nirukta VI. 32.
4. Indian Literature, p. 79n.
5. Bhāgavata VII. 13. 12.
6. The Magadhan Literature, Calcutta, 1923, p. 2.
7. See Indian Historical Quarterly, XV. 19a-207. for the Soma.
8. JBORS. 1938,, pp 86-111, 'The Antiquity of Gayā'.
9. Cf. Pravaṅga (Vāyu 45. 122), Pradeśa. *Pra* may be simply a preposition separated from the verb in the passage under reference. So the place and name is really Maganda and not Pramaganda.
10. Manu X. 11,

Boundary of Magadha.

The country of Magadha extended south of the Ganges from Benares to Monghyr[1] and southwards as far as Singhbhum (or Karṇa Suvarṇa) to the source of the R. Dāmodara.[2] In the days of Buddha,[3] the kingdom of Magadha was bounded on the east by the river Campā, on the south by the Vindhyā mountain, on the east by the R. Śoṇa and on the north by the Ganges. Magadha (inclusive of Aṅga) consisted of 80,000 villages,[4] and it had a circumference of some three hundred leagues. The cornfields of Magadha were rich and fertile[5] and each Magadha field was about four miles in extent.[6] Magadha, according to the Vāyu, was situated in the eastern territory along with many other kingdoms.[7]

Name and People.

Buddhaghoṣa[8] gives some very fanciful explanations of the word Magadha. King Cetiya (Cedī Uparicara) was about to be swallowed up by the earth for having introduced lying into the world. He was admonished by those standing round 'do not enter deep' (*mā gadham pavisa*) hence the name. The other explanation is that the king said to those who were digging the earth, (*mā gadham karotha*) 'do not make the ditch'. But elsewhere the explanation by Buddhaghoṣa himself seems to be that the country was so called because it was the residence of a tribe of Kṣatriyas called Māgadha. There are a large number of Maga or Śākadvīpīya Brāhmaṇas in Magadha, and hence the probability of the country being called Magadha after them. The authors of the Vedic Index[9] hold

1. Śabdārthacintāmaṇi.
2. Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. N. Majumdar, Cal. 1924, p. 521.
3. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, by Dr. G.P. Mallalasekhara, London, 1938, Vol. II. p. 403.
4. Vinaya I. 179.
5. Theragatha, verse 208.
6. Anguttara Nikāya III. 122.
7. Vāyu 45. 122-3.
8. Sutta Nipāta Commentary I. 135.
9. See 'Magadha'.

that the theory of mixed caste cannot be accepted to explain such tribal names as Māgadha. The fact that Māgadha is often a minstrel in later times may be accounted for on the assumption[1] that the country was the home of minstrelsy. Magadha being the paramount power of India for many centuries, its kings were accustomed to high-sounding praises and the wandering bards from Magadha were apt to visit the more western provinces of India and hence the Vandins hailing especially from Magadha were called Māgadhas, belonging to Magadha.

In the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa[2] the people of Magadha are famous for their loud voice. In the Kauśītakī Āraṇyaka[3] the views of Madhyama, a Magadhan Brāhmaṇa, are quoted with respect. The dislike of the Magadhas was in all probability due, as[4] Oldenberg thinks, to the fact that the Magadhas were not really Brahmanised. Weber[5] thinks it due to the persistence of aboriginal blood and the growth of Buddhism. Pargiter[6] goes far to suggest that in Magadha the Aryans met and mingled with a body of invaders from the east by sea.

In the Rāmāyaṇa[7] Vasiṣtha asked Sumantra to invite many pious kings including the Magadhan king—the brave, proficient in all sciences, obliging, very generous, virtuous and the best among men. The king of Magadha occupied a prominent position in the Svayamvara of Indumatī.[8] Hemacandra[9] describes the glories of Magadha in a very high tone.

1. Ancient Indian Tribes, by Dr. B. C. Law, 1926, p. 94.
2. T. Br. III. 4 1. 1.
3. K. A. VIII. 13.
4. Budhha, p. 400 n.
5. Indian Literature, 79 n 1.
6. JRAS. 1908, pp. 851-3.
7. Rām I. 13. 26-7.
8. Raghuvamśa Canto VI.
9. Pariśiṣthaparvan I 7-12.

CHAPTER IX

Barhadratha Dynasty (*Pre-Bhārata War*)

The genealogy of the dynasty is found in the Purāṇas[1] and the epics.[2] The Mbh. and the Purāṇas make Bṛhadratha the founder of the Magadhan dynasty, but Vālmīki ascribes this honour to his father Vasu who founded Vasumatī which subsequently came to be known as Girivraja. The Ṛgveda[3] mentions a Bṛhadratha twice, but there is nothing for or against the supposition to credit him as the founder of Magadha. But if it is accepted it would make Magadha contemporaneous with the Vedic civilisation.[4] The Jainas[5] mention two early kings of Girivraja-namely Samudravijaya and his son Gaya who laid the foundation of Gayā, the holiest city in Magadha.

Vasu, the fourth in succession from Sudhanvan—the son of Kuru, conquered the kingdom of Cedi which belonged to the Yādavas and obtained the title of Caidyoparicara—the overcomer of the Cedis. He has been praised in the Ṛgveda[6] for he gave a hundred camels and ten thousand cows in generosity. He subdued and annexed the adjoining countries in c. 2,203 { 1867+336 (12x28) } B. C. He had seven sons[7] : Bṛhadratha, Pratyagraha, Kuśa, Maruta, Yadu, Matsya and Sattama, and he established them in separate kingdoms. Bṛhadratha, the eldest, took Magadha and founded the dynasty. 'It was at this time that Magadha for the first time took a prominent place in traditional history'.[8]

1. Vā. 99. 217-28; Mt. 50. 23-34; Hv. 32. 90-8; Vṣ. IV. 19; Ag. 277. 27-31; Gār. I. 140. 25-30; Bhāg. IX. 22. 4-9.
2. Mbh. I. 60; Rām. I. 32. 1-11.
3. Rv. I. 36. 18. (Let Agni, the arrester of the robber, bring hither Navavāstva Bṛhadratha and Turviti).
4. RV. X. 49. 6. (I, the slayer of Vṛtra, am he, who cursed Navavāstva and Bṛhadratha.
5. See my article in the Hindustan Review, November, 1939, p. 252.
6. S· B. E. Vol. 45, p. 83, n. 3.
7. R.V. VIII. 5. 37.
8. AIHT. p. 282.

The identity[1] of Apacara or Upacara Ceṭi or simply Cecca with Caidya Uparicara Vasu may be accepted. The Jātaka[2] version is substantially the same. According to it Upacara of Ceṭi perished with his kingdom, and his five sons founded five different kingdoms at the advice of a Brahmana who had turned an ascetic since his retirement from the post of royal chaplain ? Vasu who could range in the sky and move in the air, married Girikā and his son Bṛhadratha laid the foundation of Girivraja—the mountain abode or the the abode of Giri or Girikā—after the name of his mother in circa. 2,170 B. C. Bṛhadratha slew Ṛṣabha[3] and had made three drums out of the hide. He, of great prowess, surrounded by many splendours, was protected by the Golāṅgulas[4] on the vulture peak.

Jarāsandha.

Jarāsandha was the son[5] of Bhuvana who married the two beautiful twin daughters of the king of Kāśī and by the blessings of a great Kauśika sage he had a very powerful son—Jarāsandha who was nursed by Jarā, an excellent midwife. Jarāsandha was present at the Svayamvara of Draupadī and also at that of Citrāṅgadā, the daughter of the Kaliṅga king. In course of time Jarāsandha rose to the highest power[6] and extended his supremacy[7] over Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Cedi and as far as Mathurā where Kaṁsa, the Yādava king, who had married his two daughters—Asti and Prāpti, acknowledged him as an overlord. When Kaṁsa was slain by Kṛṣṇa, his wives urged their father to revenge. Jarāsandha, the Great, besieged Mathurā with his immense army of 23 *akṣauhinīs*[8] to

1. JDL. 1930, 'Studies in Jātakas' by B. C. Sen, p. 12.
2. Ceṭiya Jātaka (No. 422).
3. Mbh. II. 21.
4. Mbh. XII. 29. If the Ṛkṣas may be equated with the Licchavīs the Golangulas would be the Gorangas of Nepal.
5. Mbh. II. 17. 19.
6. Mbh. II. 13; 18.; Hv. 87 to 93; 117; Br. 155. 1-12.
7. Mbh. XII. 5; Hv. 117.
8. An akṣauhini consisted of 21, 870 elephants and chariots each, 65, 610 horsemen and 109, 350 foot-soldiers. So the total strength of the Magadhan army was 50, 30, 100. It seems the whole nation was in arms. The

destroy Kṛṣṇa along with his whole tribe. The Yādavas were very much troubled and they were forced to migrate to Dvārakā.

Jarāsandha worshipped Śiva and he kept many defeated kings at Girivraja in the temple of Śive in order to sacrifice them. Yudhiṣṭhira thought he must be defeated before the performance of the Rājasūya. Kṛṣṇa, Bhīma, and Arjuna started from the land of the Kurus to Magadha and they entered the city of Girivraja without weapons in the guise of Brahmacārins. They went to the abode of Jarāsandha who welcomed them without speaking to them in consequence of the vow which he would not break before night. He quartered them in the sacrificial apartments and himself retired to the palace. At midnight he came to them, as he always observed the vow that as soon as he should hear of the arrival of scholars even at midnight, he would immediately come out and grant them an audience. Kṛṣṇa declared that they had come as his foes. Kṛṣṇa challenged him to set the monarchs free or to fight. Jarāsandha chose to fight and ordered Sahadeva to be installed on the throne. In a personal combat or duel which lasted for 14 days with Bhīma, Jarāsandha was killed and the victors drove through the city on the royal chariot. Jarāsandha had four generals : Kauśika, Citrasena, Haṁsa, and Ḍimbhaka.

In the Jaina literature[1], Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha both figure as *ardhacakravartins* and hence the different versions. According to them a pitched battle was fought between his forces and those of the Yādavas and the Vidyādharas (probably mountain chiefs) on a plain in Saurāṣṭra near the village Sināpalli[1] where later on a new city named Ānandapura was foun-

strength of the British forces in India was 3,25,170 only before the outbreak of the Second World War.

1. New Indian Antiquary, Vol. p. 161. et seq. 'Ancient Indian History and Research Work' by P.C. Divanji; Jinasenas' Harivamśa Purāṇa p.537; Pariśiṣṭaparvan VIII. 8.

Kṛṣṇa Legend in the Jain Canonical Literature, by M. N. Deshpande, Jain Antiquary Vol, X, 27,

ded and Kṛṣṇa himself killed Jarāsandha with his disc. The event took place in B. C. 1, 881 (1,867+14). Kṛṣṇa had many powerful chiefs under him and Samudravijaya was one of them. Samudravijaya led the ten Daśārṇa princes and is mentioned as a powerful king of Soriyapura—a city where Vasudeva ruled. His wife's name was Śivā.

Sahadeva.

Sahadeva was forced to pay tributes and he went as one of the vassals of the Pāṇḍavas at the Rājasūya sacrifice. In the Bhārata war, he fought valiantly but was killed by Droṇa in B. C. 1,867. Dhṛṣṭaketu[1], the brother of Sahadeva, also sided with the Pāṇḍavas and lost his life in the battle-field. But the Magadhas did not forgive the Pāṇḍavas for ever. Jayatsena, another son of Jarāsandha, took up the cause of Dùryodhana[2] and while fighting in the field was killed by Abhimanyu. And after the battle of Kurukṣetra when the horse, let loose at the Aśvamedha sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira, was proceeding towards Hastināpura, Meghasandhi, son of Sahadeva, offered battle to Arjuna, but suffered defeat at the hands of the latter[3].

Post-Bhārata Chronology.

The late K. P. Jayaswal[4] very wistely laid down that 'among the dynastic totals preference should be given to those with odd numbers as against those in round numbers which are often doubtful, and the total for dynastic reigns, given in the Purāṇas, should receive special attention. If a traditional aggregate is supported by all the Purāṇas, it should be taken as a guide in selecting figures for individual reigns from divergent data and we should assume no figure without the backing of some text. Moreover, in the absence of any independent external corroboration we cannot but accept the Puraṇic chronology and order of succession as the only authentic source.

1. Mbh. Udyoga Parva. 57.
2. Mbh. I. 186.
3. Mbh. Aśvamedha. 82.
4. JBORS. I. 67.

Bṛhadrathas.

It is only after the time of the Mbh. war that the Purāṇas give the regnal years and the dynastic total of kings that ruled in Magadha. 'The Purāṇas divide the Bṛhadratha dynasty of Magadha, like all other dynasties, into two main chronological groups, (a) those who flourished before the Mbh. war, (b) and those who flourished after the war. The post-Mbh. kings of the main dynasties have been further subdivided into three groups, e.g , the post-Mbh. Bṛhadrathas are divided into the 'past', the 'present', and the 'future'. The dividing line between the 'past' and the 'future' kings consists of the kings at 'present' reigning. These 'present kings' lived some six generations after the Mbh. war. One of these kings was Adhisīma (or Adhisāma) –Kṛṣṇa of the Paurava dynasty under whose patronage, the Purāṇic data of what was then considered the past history, seem to have been originally collected.[1] The contemporary of Adhisīmakṛṣṇa in Magadha was Senājit. The narration about the kings before Senājit is put in the Purāṇas in the past tense and that of the latter ones in the future. They call Senājit 'the then present reigning king'. From the time of the battle to Senājit six kings are named excluding Senājit and from and including him to the end 16 kings are mentioned. There were thus 32 kings altogether, 10 before the battle and 22 after, or from the standpoint of Senājit's reign 16 past and 16 future'.[2]

Their Duration.

All the Purāṇas, after chronicling the reign of the Magadha sovereigns from Sahadeva 'who fell in the Bhārata war' upto Ripuñjaya give the following lines to close the Bṛhadratha dynasty :

Dvāviṁśatirnṛpā hyete bhavitāro Bṛhadrathāḥ ।
Pūrṇaṁ varṣasahasraṁ vai teṣāṁ rājyam bhaviṣyati ॥

1. Vāyu. 37. 252.
2. Pargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 14.

'(Verily) these (are) the future twenty-two Bṛhadratha kings. Their rule will indeed (cover) full thousand (years)'. (Triveda). If we accept the other reading 'dvātriṁśacca' as given in some manuscripts, the verse may be translated as "These (are) thirty-two kings and verily the rule of the future Bṛhadrathas will be full thousand (years)'. 'And these thirty-two kings are the future Bṛhadrathas; their kingdom will last full thousand years indeed'. (Pargiter[1].) "The latter (*ete*) are the thirty-two future Bṛhadrathas. The rule of the Bṛhadrathas (*teṣām*) will indeed cover full thousand years'. (Jayaswal)[2].

A rare manuscript of the Matsya Purāṇa (jMt) omits the above two lines and gives the following ones instead :

Ṣoḍaśaite nṛpā jñeyā bhavitāro Bṛhadrathāḥ ।

Trayo viṁśādhikam teṣām rājyaṁca śatasaptakam ॥

These sixteen kings are known as the future Bṛhadrathas and the period of their reign is seven hundred and twentythree years. (Triveda) 'These sixteen kings are to be known as the future Bṛhadrathas and their kingdom will last seven hundred and twenty-three years'. (Pargiter). 'The latter (*ete*) sixteen kings are known as the future Bṛhadrathas, the reign of the above (*teṣām*) (the post-Mbh. Bṛhadrathas) is of seven centuries, and their (regnal) age over twenty years (each). (Jayaswal). He would prefer the reading '*vayo*' instead of '*trayo*' above.

Pargiter's Explanation.

There is hardly any difference between my translation and that of Pargiter but when the learned antiquarian seeks to give his ingenious explanation, there is a great chasm. According to him 'lines 30-31 jMt take the stand-point of Senājit's reign and speak of him and his successors as the sixteen future kings and say prima facie that their duration was 723 years. Lines 32-33 which are not in jMt reckon (in a way) from the beginning and speak of all the 32 kings as future since most of them were posterior to the battle, and thus they say

1. P. T. 68.
2. JBORS. IV. 26-35. The Bṛhadratha Chronology by K. P. Jayaswal.

the whole dynasty lasted 1,000 years. But if we can read lines 30-31 as two independent sentences and treat *teṣām* as applying not merely to these 16 future kings, but to the Bṛhadrathas generally, their purport stands thus—'these 16 kings are to be known as the future Bṛhadrathas and their kingdom (i. e. the kingdom of Bṛhadrathas) lasts 723 years.[1]

Jayaswal's Criticism

In the opinion of Jayaswal, Pargiter's view that the figure 32 for the kings refers to the whole dynasty (10 before and 22 after the war) is untenable on the following grounds. (i) The pronoun *ete* (these, the last spoken of) for the 32 can refer only to the Post-Mbh. kings just described above. (ii) It is possible to describe the Post-Mbh Bṛhadrathas as the 'future' Bṛhadrathas as they all come after the war and a very large number of them consists of the future Bṛhadrathas proper. But it would be impossible to describe the kings who reigned before the Mbh. war as 'future kings' as in the eyes of Purāṇic chronicler they pre-eminently belong to his past history, his modern history begins with the Mbh. War. (iii) The two sets of statements in the text of the four lines quoted cannot be reconciled. Seven hundred or 723 years taken for the whole dynasty would discredit[2] the full 1,000 years' as recognised by Pargiter himself.

Jayaswal's Explanation

Jayaswal advocates that *teṣām* in the first verse quoted above does not refer to the 32 future kings; for them *ete*. has been used and similarly the employment of the different pronouns *ete* and *teṣām* (in the second stanza) shows that the two statements contained in the two lines refer to two independent subject matters. He argues that the chronicler considering the 1,000 years wrong for the post-Mbh. Bṛhadrathas puts down 'seven centuries' in round numbers as the total of their regnal

1. Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, edited by F. E. Pargiter, Oxford University Press, 1913, p. 13.
2. P. V. 13. Cf. This rendering would, of course, discredit lines 32-33.

years. He maintains that the writer accepted 32 or 33 as the total number of the post-Mbh. Bṛhadrathas and gave the average reign period 20 years or 21·03 ($\frac{700}{33}$) years.

Criticism

Instead of using portions of Purāṇic data for supporting pre-conceived notions, or far-fetched interpretations, it is better just to put forward in a collected form the data as they exist literally and faithfully, and to see if they give an intelligible account. All the Purāṇas give only 22 as the number of the future kings who must be reckoned after the Mbh. war. The Paurāṇikas could not have been so foolish as to name 22 kings and in the end to say that there were 32 kings. The Garuḍa names only 21 and does not give the number but says : *Ityete Bārhadrathāḥ smṛtāḥ.* Of course, the difference of one or two would not have mattered. The kings named are only important kings as the Purāṇas proclaim in the very beginning : *Pradhānataḥ pravakṣyāmi gadato me nibodhata.* (I will declare them according to their prominence, listen as I speak. (P. T. 67).

We do not know as to how many names were originally omitted. One thing is certain that there could not have been less than 22 kings after the Great Indian War. There is hardly any justification for accepting 32 as the exact number of the future Bṛhadratha kings, although it is possible to get the number increased from 22 to 32 by adding a few kings according to our reconstructive principle as discussed onwards. The reading '*dvātriṁśacca*' may be explained in two ways.[1] It may be the mistake of the copyists who were generally misled by the change of script as it is possible to confuse '*viṁśa*' and '*triṁśa*' in ancient manuscripts as attested by Pargiter in so many cases or (2) they may have had in mind the ten pre-Mbh. war kings.

Jayaswal's argument that *teṣām* does not refer to the future Bṛhadrathas but to the whole dynasty will carry no conviction for *teṣam* cannot but refer to the *bhavitṛṇām Bṛhadrathānām* (the future Bṛhadrathas) according to the rule of part prose-

1. P. T. 14 n. 21.

order. Moreover, it would be too much to expect that the Paurāṇikas should give the regnal years of the post-Mbh. kings only and then sum up the total of the whole dynasty instead of totalling those of the post-war kings whose regnal years they narrate with certainty. The figure 723 for 32 kings (22 post-Mbh.+pre-Mbh. war kings) as accepted by Pargiter has no justification but to bring within possibility the average reign of 22½ or 22.6 (723/32) years per king. The learned antiquarian suggests the reading '*vayo*' instead of '*trayo*' to bring the total period 700 years for 32 kings and thus to give an average reign of just under twenty-two years which would be viṁśādhikam (more than twenty). Jayaswal concludes that the reading cannot be anything but '*vayo*' and the period 700 refers to the post-Mbh. kings and one thousand to the whole dynasty (post-Mbh.+pre-Mbh. kings). If his explanation is accepted we get 21.21 (700/33) years for the post-Mbh., kings and 30 years (300/10) (according to the Purāṇic authority as understood by Jayaswal) or 13.5 (203/15) (1727-1424) years for the pre-war kings on the average for he places the beginning of the Bṛhadratha dynasty and the Mbh. War in B. C. 1,727 and B. C. 1,424 respectively. So he stands contradicted on his own understanding by giving an arbitrary average of 21.21; 20 (300/15); or 13.5 years at his discretion. He brings the total period 697 instead of the round number 700 by summing the regnal years of kings and, of course, in so doing, he takes their regnal years to suit his theories.

No Primogeniture

Succession to the throne in Magadha was held by election and by primogeniture only in particular cases. We find that there are 'traces of the existence of the elective principle in the Vedic times though it is not clear whether the people selected the king from among the members of the royal house or those of all the nobles'[1]. The Atharvaveda[2] is a clear on the point

1. Hindu Polity, by N. N. Law. pp. 9-10.
2. A. V. III. 4. 2.

that the subjects chose the king. Megasthenes[1] informs us that 'the Indians elected their sovereign on the principle of merit'. The ministers of king Śauri said, "There is no question of the youngest or the eldest. Sovereignty is for men who want it." Moreover, it is on record that kings like Śiśunāga, Āryaka, Samudragupta, and Harṣa owed their thrones to the people who elected them. Kings in ancient India had to perform the ritual Ratnahavis[2] by going through door to door of the king-makers (Rajakartṛs). The right of primogeniture was never strictly adhered to in ancient India. The practice of selecting one member of the royal family to the exclusion of another less qualified is exemplified by the legend of Kuru brothers Devāpi[3] and Śantanu referred to in the Nirukta.[4] In the Mbh.[5] Yayāti is questioned by the populace as to why he was giving the kingdom to Puru instead of the eldest Yadu, the son of Devayānī. Thereupon, the king says,[6] "The son who like his father is devoted to the manes, gods and sages in offering sacrifices and who is the most virtuous amongst the many sons, is called the eldest son". And Puru is approved.

Average Reign.

The average regnal years as understood by Jayaswal are nowhere given in the annals of the Sanskrit literature and this average conception is entirely new and strange to the ancients. And, it would be too much to judge the average regnals period of the ancient world from our present average standard which always differs from country to country according to the peculiar circumstances of each.

1. Ancient India as described by Megasthenes & Arrian, Cal. 1926 p. 206.
2. Ait. Br. VIII. 17. 5; Av. III. 5. 7.
3. Mbh. I. 79.
4. R. V. X. 98. 5.
5. Nirukta II. 10.
6. Ibid. I. 95. 44.

Pradhan[1] accepts an average of 28 years on the basis of ten ruling dynasties of the world. Raichodhury[2] and Jaiswal[3] both accept an average[4] of 30 years at places. We shall not be unjustified in admitting an average of 28 years for the Pre-Bhārata war rings when there was less strain on life in comparison to modern times. Moreover, the Purāṇas do not always say that the successor was the son or otherwise of the predecessor. Generally he is in the family of the former (Cf. *anvaye* or *dayàda*). An old copy of the Vāyu (gVā) says : *Ete mahabalāhs sarve* (all of them were very powerful Kings) instead of the reading : *Dvāviṁśatir nṛpā hyete* (22 kings). The contention that since they were all very powerful, some of them might have been assassinated for the throne and hence short-lived and in that case we cannot have a long average, can be easily answered if we remember that only the powerful kings are long-lived with long reigns although some of them may be assassinated, for we find that only the great Moghuls have long reigns whereas the later Moghuls are very short-lived with short reigns although their number is considerable. Moreover, we are given the regnal years of individual kings of Magadha in odd numbers reign by raign. Although we cannot support the long reigns in succession of kings in a dynasty, yet it is possible to support them in individual cases and for the dynasty on the only supposition that some names are lost beyond recovery. Perhaps it may not be safe to discard the Purāṇic regnal years of Magadhan Kings and to prepare the backbone of history on the supposition of an arbitrary average. Hence it has been tried to justify the Purāṇic regnal years if they can be accounted for by any stretch of reasoning and if they are not contradicted by any other authority.

Thirty five Sultans sat on the throne of Delhi during a period of 333 years from 1,193 to 1,526 A. C., whereas only 13 Rāṇās

1. Chronology of Ancient India, pp. 162-74.
2. PHAI. p. 43 (IV edition).
3. JBORS. I. 70.
4. Cf. The average of 29.5 years to the 8 or 29.82 to the seven Imperial Guptas, and 369 years covered by 11 kings of the Sisku dynasty of Babylon. JBORS, I. 70.

ruled over Mewar during the period. Of these 16 on the throne of Delhi and three on that of Mewar died unnatural death. In Gaud (Bengal) there were 43 rulers for a period of 339 years from 1,199 to 1,538 A.C., whereas just adjoining to that in Orissa there were only 14 rulers during the period.[1]

As regards the kings of the pre-Mahābhārata war, I was compelled by circumstances in which a student of ancient Indian history is placed, not to accept an average reign of more than 28 years per king, for we are not given the reign of each and every king and whenever some particular kings are given their regnal years, they defy our imagination and the sense of a historian and hence we are forced to reject them to build our chronology on an assumed average, be what it may, till hard facts may enable us to stand on a firmer ground.

1,001 *Years for* 32 *Kings.*

So the period one thousand years in round figure or one thousand and one years as given by the Viṣṇu Purāṇa may be accepted for 22 kings of the Purāṇas or 32 kings according to the proposed reconstruction, although there is a possibility that the total number of kings may be even more than 32. By actual calculation we find exactly 1,001 years for 32 kings, an average of 31. 4. years and 723 (of the Purāṇas) or 724 (Triveda) years for 16 (Purāṇas) or 22 kings (Triveda) which gives an average reign of 32. 8 years only, after Ṣenājit. And even this difference of one year (734-723) can be easily understood if we remember that the Visṇu gives 1,001 instead of 1,000 years of the other Purāṇas. This is supported to a surprising degree by the faithful translation of the Purāṇic passages which constitute the only source that can be consulted for the period.

Reconstruction

Dr. Jayaswal is to be congratulated for pointing out some of the omitted unimportant names of the kings in the dynastic list. 1. In the very beginning two readings Somādhi and Mār-

1. Itihāsa—Praveśa, by Jayachandra Vidyālankara, Allahabad, 1941, p.257.

jāri are found but not in the same work and they are styled relation and son respectively of Sahadeva. 2. After Śrutaśravas, some MSS. read Ayutāyu and others read Apratīpī. Some of the Purāṇas give 36 years and others 26 years only. The previous king Śrutaśravas has been given a very lengthy reign of 64 years. It seems that the reign of one of the last two kings Ayutāyu or Apratīpī is included in that of Śrutaśravas. 3. Instead of Niṣamitra we also come across Śarmamitra. There might have been two kings and their regnal years combined in one for some of the texts assign him 40 years, and others 100 years. 4. After Śatruñjaya, Mt. gives Vibhu but Bd. reads Ripuñjaya instead of him. Some MSS. of the Vṣ. also read Ripu and Ripuñjaya. According to Jayaswal, a MS. of A. C. 1,483 (gVā) suggests Mahābala as a distinct king.5. After Kṣema some of the texts give Kṣemaka instead of Suvrata or Anuvrata. He has been given a very long reign of 64 years. It seems Suvrata and Kṣemaka were the sons of Kṣema and came to the throne in succession and their joint regnal years are given. 6. The Vāyu gives 58 years for Nirvṛti and Eman, while the Mt. omits Eman and retains only Nirvṛti and Bḍ. omits Nirvṛti and retains only king Eman. So Eman must be one of the lost Kings. 7. Trinetra is given 28 years only by Mt. whereas Bḍ., Vṣ., and Gar. call him Suśrama. The Bhāg. calls him Śrama and the Vā. Suvrata. So Suśrama may be included in the list of the omitted kings. 8. Another variant amongst the names is Mahīnetra and Sumati, so they must be considered different kings. 9. The ninth king who can be clearly traced is Śatruñjayī who is given by a Vāyu (dVā.) MS :

Rājyam Sucalo bhokṣyati atha Śatruñjayī tataḥ. 10. There were probably two kings Satyajit and Sarvajit who reigned in succession. The Purāṇas give him unanimously a long reign of 83 years. Sarva cannot be read as Satya and so they should be taken to be distinct kings.

Thus it is possible to name some 32 kings of the post-war Bṛhadratha dynasty. Others, if any, cannot be restored with our present knowledge of antiquity.

No.	Name of Kings.	Pradhan.	Jayaswal.	Pargiter.	Triveda.
1. 2.	Śomādhi Mārjāri	50	58	58	58
3. 4.	Śrutaśravas Apratīpī	6	60	64	60
5.	Ayutāyu	26	26	26	36
6. 7.	Niramitra Śarmamitra	40	40	40	40
8.	Surakṣa or Sukṣatra	50	50	56	58
9.	Bṛhatkarman	23	23	23	23
10.	Senājit	23		23	50
11. 12.	Śatruñajaya Mahābala or Ripunjaya I.	35	35	40	40
13.	Vibhu	28	25	28	28
14.	Śuci	6	6	58	64
15.	Kṣema	28	28	28	28
16. 17.	Ksemaka Anuvrata	24	60	64	64
18.	Sunetra	5	5	35	35
19. 20.	Nirvṛti Eman	56	58	58	58
21. 22.	Trinetra Suśrama	28	28	28	38
23.	Dyumatsena	8	8	48	48
24. 25.	Mahinetra Sumati	35	20	33	33
26. 27.	Sucala Śatruñjayi	22	22	32	32
28.	Sunīta	40	40	40	40
29. 30.	Satyajit Sarvajit	30	30	83	83
31.	Visvajit	25	25	25	35
32.	Ripuñjaya II.	50	50	50	50
		638 yrs.	697 yrs.	940 yrs[1].	1,001 yrs.

1. AIHT. p. 179.

It is not possible to accept the suggestion of some of the critics that all variants of the names must be accepted as distinct names of kings, as they are really not variants, but they crept in due to the mistakes of the copyists in course of centuries. Śataśravas is only a mislection for Śrutaśravas just as Sukṣara, Sukṣatra, Sumitra, Sunakṣatra and Svakṣatra may be regarded as the copyist's mistakes as letters are easily likely to be interchanged or if the copyist was a bit intelligent he would easily introduce certain equivalent word to show his own learning in his copy. Vihārṇa carries no meaning and Bahakarmaka tallies with Bṛhatkarmā in meaning. Had there been Vṛhiṣena or some such word, there would have been some possibility of his distinct existence. Karmajit and Dharmajit are also akin to Senājit. Satyaka, of course, is a possibility after Satrunjaya. Thus there is possibility of adding only two more names as they seem to be distinct variants preserved by different Purāṇas. The average reign assumed and the number of the kings stated should guide us to arrive at the correct number of kings. Moreover, we get the reading 32 instead of 22 and hence the selection to stick to the number 32 for the kings.

It has been shown elsewhere (Appendix B) that the Mahābhārata war was fought in B. C. 1,867, and so Somādhi, the son of Sahadeva came to the throne after him in B. C. 1867. The dynasty was put to an end in B. C. 866 at the hands of Pradyota, the Brāhmaṇa minister and commander-in-chief of Ripuñjaya II, the last ruler of the dynasty.

Throughout the history of Magadha, we find that the Brāhmaṇas play a very important part. They held the high position of the prime minister as well as that of the commander-in-chief. Whenever the king, who was generally a Kṣatriya, was weak or issueless, they did not fail to take advantage of it. Ripuñjaya II, the last of the Bṛhadrathas, was succeeded by a Brāhmaṇa dynasty of the Pradyotas. And when the Śiśunāgas supplanted the Pradyotas, they were publicly acclaimed as the brothers of Kṣatriyas. The Nandas, who succeeded the Śiśunāgas, were uprooted by Cāṇakya—a Brāhmaṇa. Bṛhadratha, the last of

the Mauryas was also put to death by his Brāhmaṇa commander-in-chief Puṣyamitra. Thus we find that the Brāhmaṇas maintained their supremacy throughout, and very often they were the king-makers.

CHAPTER X.

Pradyotas.

It has been generally held[1] that Pradyota of the Purāṇas which call him the successor of the last Bṛhadratha did not rule in Magadha and he had nothing to do with it. 'He has been held identical with Pradyota, a king of Avantī, a powerful rival of Bimbisāra and a contemporary of Buddha on the following grounds : (a) No other Pradyota but the one a king of Avantī is known to history, and the Purāṇas also refer to a king Pradyota; (b) the sons of both bear the same name Pālaka; (c) the Matsya Purāṇa begins the dynasty as *Bṛhadratheṣv atīteṣu vītihotreṣvavantiṣu*''.

The Vītihotras were not the kings of Magadha but they ruled contemporaneously with the rulers of Magadha[2]. As Puṇaka, the father of Pradyota, is named just after the Vītihotras, the king whom he killed to anoint his son was a Vītihotra. According to Bāṇa[3], Prince Kumārasena, son of Pradyota, of the Puṇaka family, was slain at the festival of Mahākāla by the vampire Tālajaṅgha, while (he was) crazy with discussion about selling human flesh at the butcher-house. 'Majumdar holds that 'as Pulaka ousted Vītihotras, by killing the last king of that family to make room for his son, the Vītihotras or the Tālajanghas were furious and they retaliated their wrong by killing a son of Pradyota. Thus the Pradyotas who ruled after the Vītihotras were rulers of Avantī. Pradyota is identical with Caṇḍa

1a. JBORS. VII. pp. 113- 4. H. D. Bhide and S. N. Majumdar Śāstrī.

b. IHQ. 1930, p. 678 ff. 'The Riddle of the Pradyota Dynasty' Jyotirmay Sen.

c. JIH. XI. p.288 ff. 'Some Problems about the Pradyotas of Avantī by Amalānanda Ghosh,

2. Pargiter's Text, p. 24.

3. Harṣacarita, Ch. VI. p. 199 (Pārab's edition).

Pradyota Mahāsena, the contemporary of Buddha and Bimbisāra.'

Foot-Note to Śiśunāgas ?

'The Purāṇas give no indication that the Pradyota dynasty is to be read as 'a foot-note[1] to the Śiśunāga dynasty 'or that the Pradyota they mention is the contemporary of Śiśunāga Bimbisāra. Had it been so, the Pradyota list could not have come before the Śiśunāga. Its proper place was either along with Bimbisāra, and his successors, or at the end of the Śiśunāga list'. Raichoudhury rightly says,[2] 'In the Purāṇas contemporary kings are sometimes represented as successors and collaterals as lineal descendants. Whereas the earlier dynasties (the Pauravas and Ikṣvākus) are treated of less elaborately, the Magadha dynasty proper, from the Bṛhadrathas downwards are carefully drawn up, and where necessary, contemporary dynasties, have been separately, and summarily mentioned.'

Pradyota subdued by Abhaya.

'Bimbisāra is fifth in descent from Śiśunāga; and if the Pradyota line began its rule in his days, its mention before even Śiśunāga is absurd. Mere similarity of names is no justification for altering the arrangement of the Purāṇas and identifying the two dynasties as one. Again, the Bṛhadrathas, who are placed before the Pradyotas, ruled in Magadha, and the Śiśunāgas also, coming after the Pradyotas, ruled in Magadha. How and why should the Pradyotas then come in between the two dynasties of Magadha if they (the Pradyotas) ruled in Avantī'. Rapson's[3] suggestion that 'the Ujjain dynasty has been included in the Magadha list because it overshadowed and dominated the Magadha dynasty' is unconvincing for even in the days of Bimbisāra whose contemporary Pradyota (Caṇḍa) was, Magadha was at its glory and it bowed before none. Pra-

1. JBORS. I. 106.
2. PHAI. p. 31 (3rd edition).
3. Cambridge History of India, I. 311.

dyota addressed Bimbisara as 'Your Majesty' (*deva*)[1]. Moreover, a story about Pradyota king of Ujjayinī occurs in the Kumārapāla Pratibodha[2] in which he has been shown as having been captured by Abhaya, a prince of Magadha. He humbled the pride of Pradyota who was worshipped by fourteen kings at Ujjayinī. Pradyota was made to bow at the feet of Śreṇika, the father of prince Abhaya : 'Under the Bṛhadrathas and from the Śiśunāgas down to the Mauryas, Magadha was the dominant power in India; and naturally the Purāṇas enumerate the dynasties which ruled there in succession. Therefore, the mention cf the Pradyota line would be appropriate only if it had once ruled in Magadha.'

Vaccum.

D. R. Bhandarkar[3] draws the following possible inferences :—
(a) 'The Magadha power was eclipsed and overthrown by the Pradyotas of Avantī, and naturally there was a confusion between the Bṛhadrathas and the Śiśunāgas. He fills up the gap not by the Pradyotas but by the Vajjis. (b) The Bṛhadrathas were immediately succeeded by the Pradyotas on the throne of Magadha.'

The dynasties in India are generally named after their first kings, e.g. Aikṣvāku, Aila, Pauravā, Bārhadratha and Cupta dynasties etc,. Caṇḍa Pradyota of Avantī was not the first king of the dynasty and so there is no probability of his being the founder of the Pradyota dynasty.

Fathers of two Pradyotas

'According to the Purāṇas[4], Pradyota's father was Pulaka. But in the Kathāsaritsāgara[5], Caṇḍa Pajjota's father is named Jayasena. There the genealogy is Mahendravarman, Jayasena,

1. Vinaya Piṭaka, p. 271 (Rahula's edition).
2 Kumārapāla Pratibodha of Somaprabhācārya, ed. by Muni Jinarāj Vijaya, Baroda, 1920, (Gaikwad Oriental Series XIV), pp 76-83 (Paradārāgamanaviṣaye Pradyota kathā).
3. Carmichael Lectures I. 73.
4. P. T. p. 18
5. K. S. S. XI. 34.

Mahāsena (Caṇḍa Pradyota). The Tibetan authority[1] calls Pajjota the son of Anantanemī and he was born on the same day as the Buddha. Pradyota was Mahāsena (having a large army). So his father might have been called Jayasena (having a victorious army). It is possible that Anantanemī was the real name of his father and Jayasena only a title as Pradyota is called Mahāsena[2]. The historical names given in the Kathāsaritsāgara are generally found to be correct, in many cases. So if its correctness be admitted, it follows necessarily that Pradyota of Avanti is a king other than his Purāṇic namesake.'

Their Successors.

'Indeed, the name of the successors of the two Pradyotas is Pālaka. Bhāsa[3] mentions Gopāla Bālaka (the boy Gopāla) who was probably the eldest son of Pradyota, but Mṛcchakaṭika takes the word meaning a cowherd. The Kathāsaritsāgara[4] mentions Pālaka and Gopāla as the two sons of Pradyota. The Pālaka of Magadha was succeeded by Viśākhayūpa who is not known to any other authority. 'Pradhan[5] makes him a son of Pālaka and Jayaswal[6] that of Āryaka without any definite evidence to count upon.' Regarding the successor of Pālaka of Avanti, there is a good deal of uncertainty. The Jainas are silent on the point. Pālaka was a tyrant.[7] He was deposed by the populace in favour of Āryaka, the son of Gopāla, from the prison. The Kathāsaritsāgara[8] names Avantivardhana as Pālaka's son, but it does not state how Pālaka's reign ended and whether Avantivardhana succeeded to his father's throne. So the possible conclusions regarding the successor of Avantī Pālaka are that (a) he left no successor; (b) or that his reign ended in violent revolution and a new dynasty sat on the throne of

1. Rockhill p. 17.
2. Harṣacarita VI. p. 198; and Śaṁkara's commentary thereon.
3. Svapnavāsavadattam, Canto Vi.
4. K. S. S. Cn. 112.
5. Chronology of Ancient India, pp 235, 248.
6. JBORS. I 106.
7. Mṛcchakaṭika X. 50.
8. K. S. S. CXII. 13.

Avantī; (c) or that Avantivardhana succeeded him peacefully, but we know nothing about him. But Pālaka of Magadha leaves successors in direct line; his reign is not put to an end by revolution; and his son and successor who occupies the threne peacefully is Viśākhayūpa and not Avantivardhana. According to the Jaina tradition, the Avantī Pālaka reigned for 60 years[1]; while the Magadha Pālaka has only 24 years.'[2]

Regnal Years.

'All the Purāṇas agree in assigning 23 years to Pradyota. The reign of Avantī Pradyota seems to be much longer for he was the friend of Bimbisāra who ruled for 51 years, and when the latter was put to death by his son Ajātaśatru (32 years) Pradyota made preparations to attack Rājagṛha. Ajātaśatru was succeeded by Darśak during whose (at least) earlier years Caṇḍa Pradyota was reigning in Avantī, so Caṇḍa Pradyota's reign must be a very long one. It was Co-extensive with the whole of Bimbisāra's and Ajātaśatru's and a part of Darśak's reign. It was something over 80 (51+32 + . . .) years and he lived for more than 100 years (80 the life of Buddha+24 (32-8)+a part of the reign of Darśaka.) As against this the Magadha Pradyota has only 23 years for his reign. So it reasonably follows that Pradyota and Pālaka of Magadha and Avantī have nothing in common except the mere resemblance in names.'

'All the Purāṇas agree in saying that Pulaka killed his master and placed his own son on the throne. The Mt., Vā., and Bd. do not state who the master was; Vṣ., and Bhāg. say that it was Ripuñjaya, the last of the Bṛhadrathas of Magadha. After killing the Magadha king, the most natural thing for Pulaka to do was to place Pradyota on the throne of Magadha and not on that of Avantī. The Vṣ., and Bhāg. do not mention Avantī as the displacement of Ripuñjaya. So the accession of Pradyota took place in Magadha and not in Avantī.'

1. Indian Antiquary, 1914, p. 219.
2. P. T. 19.

Readings Discussed.

'According to Pargiter, the Mt., generally reads 'Avantiṣu' but the four MSS., fgjkMt read *abandhuṣu.* Of these jMt., is valuable as it has several special readings, which are apparently ancient.'[1] None of the other Purāṇas read *Avantiṣu.* The Bḍ. has *avartīṣu*; six of the Vā. MSS., have the same reading. So one would not be wrong to conclude that the general reading is *avartiṣu.* The eVā., reads *avarṇiṣu.* 'It is very valuable as it has readings different from the printed editions'. So the ancient versions of both the Matsya (jMt.) and Vâyu (eVā) agree in not having *Avantiṣu. Avarṇiṣu* and *Avartiṣu* mean practically the same i.e., without kinsmen. Moreover, *Avantiṣu* meaning 'in Avantī' is also out of the tune with the general Purāṇic expressions bearing the same meaning[2]. The authorities ranged against *Avantiṣu* are more numerous and of greater antiquity and authenticity. The reading *Avantiṣu* is rather a misreading for *abandhuṣu* or *avarṇiṣu* or *avartiṣu* as will be clear from the above and the following discussion on its preceeding word.

Vāyu generally and four MSS of the Matsya (cdenMt) read *vītahotreṣu*; eVā has *rītihotreṣu* whereas Bḍ, had *vīrahantṛṣu.* The word *vītihotreṣu* is found in the printed editions of the Mt., only. The general consensus of the Purāṇas is in favour of *vītahotreṣu* which means 'those whose sacrifices have ended', or *vīrahantṛṣu* 'the destroyer of the heroes' (of Bḍ.,) as one of the text gVā says that they were all very powerful (*ete mahābalāḥ sarve*). So it would appear that the Bṛhadrathas were great sacrificers and heroes. The change of reading *vītahotra* into *vītihotra* and of *avarṇiṣu* into *avantiṣu* shows the confusion. The original reading seems to be : Bṛhadratheṣvatīteṣu vītahotreṣvavarṇiṣu.। (When the Bṛhadrathas, the great sacrificers; passed away kinless.) *Avarṇiṣu* is also the

1. P. T. XXII.

2. Cf. Madhyadeśe, Girivraje, Purikāyām, Mekalāyām, Padmāvatyām Mathurāyām. P. T. pp. 10, 14, 49, 51, 52 and 53 respectively.

name of a river[1] in Mālavā and hence the confusion brought about.

'The Purāṇas speak of twenty Vītihotras who were put to an end by Mahāpadma Nanda. The Pradyotas, therefore, did not extinguish the Vītihotras of Avantī and usurp their place. So it may be concluded that the Pradyota dynasty of Magadha is in no way connected with that of Avantī and they are different altogether.

Dynasty

The total of the individual reigns and the total figure for the dynasty, as given by the Purāṇas agree with each other which is 138 years. The period 138 years fits in approximmately for the five kings of the dynasty according to our average standard i.e., of 28 years.

Ripuñjaya, the last of the Bṛhadrathas had already grown old after a long reign of 50 years. He had none to succeed him. His minister Pulaka killed his master treacherously in B. C. 866. Instead of crowning himself as the king, which was clearly against the wishes of the people, Pulaka cleverly managed to place his son Pradyota on the throne of Magadha by getting the only daughter of the last king married to his son Pradyota[2]. According to the Dacca University Library Manuscript of the Brahmāṇḍa, Munika ruled himself afrer crowning his son as the king[3]. According to all the Purāṇas he baffled the Kṣatriyas of his time and placed his son Pradyota openly on the throne of Magadha as its emperor. He was unscrupulous (*nayavartija*). He was immoral in foreign policy, and subjugated the neighbouring kings. But he was highly religious and an excellent man (*narottama*). He ruled for 23 years.

Pradyota was succeeded by his son Pálaka who ruled for 24 years. The Matsya suggests that he was a very young man when

1. Mārk. P. 57. 20.
2. T. S. Narayan Śāstrī on the authority of the Kaliyuga Rāja Vṛtānta in his Age of Śaṁkara, Appendix II.
3. IHQ. 1930, p. 978 ff. Ms. No. 215, folio 171-41. Cf. Putramabhiṣicyātha svayam rājyaṁ kariṣyati.

he came to the throne. Dīrgha Cārāyaṇa was a devoted friend[1] of Pulaka, the father of Bālaka. Cārāyaṇa probably helped Pulaka in securing the throne. But Pulaka wanted to insult his teacher Cārāyaṇa who left Magadha at the instance of the queen-mother and hence he has been given the epithet *nayavarjita*, unscrupulous. So the Arthaśāstra difinitely goes to prove the existence of a kind named Bāla ruled there and so he must belong to the Pradyot dynasty of Magadha. Pālaka's son Viśākhayūpa (*tatputro*—Bhāg.) ruled for 50 years. The Purāṇas do not suggest if Sūryaka who followed Viśākhayūpa was the son of the latter. Sūryaka was followed by his son Nandivardhana who ruled for 20 years. One version of Vā., calls him Vartivardhana. Jayaswal thinks that Vartivardhana is the same as Nandivardhana of the Śiśunāga dynasty. This theory cannot stand, as the Purāṇas are definite that Nandivardhana belonged to the Pradyota dynasty. The Pradyota dynasty of the Brāhmaṇas was supplanted by Śiśunāga in B. C. 728.

1. Arthaśāstra ch. 95 (Commentary).

CHAPTER XI.

THE ŚIŚUNĀGAS.

Amongst the earliest literature the word Śiśunāga is found in Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa[1] which says that the Ṛṣyamūka mountain was protected by the Śiśunāgas but it is doubtful if it refers to some tribes or the small elephants. Dr. S. C. Sarkar conjectures that the Śiśunāgas of the Vānara racial group of the fifteenth century B. C., are to be connected with the Śiśunāgas of the Magadhan history of VIII century B. C., and the Śiśunāgas were amongst those Vānaras[2] who sided with Sugrīva and they were relied upon for their fighting strength.'[3]

Others think that the Śiśunāgas are of foreign origin and they came to India from Elam. The theory[4] has been discussed at length by H. K. Deb. The kings of the XXII dynasty (of Egypt) are, as their names indicate, of foreign extraction. Sheshonk I founded the dynasty. The dynasty came from Eastern Asia[5] and the names of many kings of the dynasty ended with Sheshonk which is repeated four times in the dynasty. Other names are also of Asian origin. Thus it would appear that the Śiśunāgas spread far and wide at a very early date. They could not have come from outside India for whenever a race comes from outside, it is so stated in clear words as in the case of the Śākadvīpīya Brāhmaṇas[6] The Mahā-

1. Rām. III. 73. 29 and 32.

2. In Sanskrit the word vānara meant a forest tribe vāi am (vane bhavam) rátlti vánaraḥ.

3. Sarkar, pp. 102-3.

4. Journal of the American Oriental Society, 1922, pp. 194-7, 'India and Elam.'

5. Encyclopaedia Brittanica, IX, 86. (XIth Edition.)

6. Devi Bhāgavata VIII. 13.

vaṁśa Tīkā says explicitly that Sisunāga was born at Vaiśālī of a Licchavirāja and a courtesan. The child was thrown on a rubbish heap. The Nāga king of the city guarded it, but when the people crowded round and said 'Śiśu' he left it and went away and hence the name. The child was adopted by the minister's son.

According to Jayaswal[1] Śiśunāka is the correct spelling and Śiśunāga is the Prakrit form. The word Śiśunāka means 'small heaven' and Śiśunāga may be stretched to means 'the child protected by the serpent'. Both the forms are correct Sanskrit and we have no definite evidence to prefer one or the other.

Number of Kings.

In giving the genealogy minor kings are sometimes omitted. 'Sometimes transpositions, due to the mistake of copyists, occur in respect of names or reign or both'. At times different Purāṇas give different appellations of the same king, apart from minor differences in the spelling of names. Pargiter[2] holds that the correct number of kings is ten. 'But egvedfgMt reads *Daśa dvau*, eMt. *daśādvā*, kMt. *dvādaśa*, jMt. *daśa dve*, Bhāg. *dasaivaite*. and Bd. *dasa vaite*. So the reading *dvādaśa* (12) seems to have undergone transcriptional corruptions. There were originally twelve and not ten kings of the dynasty and the Buddhist records preserve the two omitted names of Anirudha and Muṇḍa.'

Total Reign.

According to Pargiter,[3] the duration of the dynasty appears to have been 163 years (but the readings accepted by him give a total period of 330 years[4]) for according to him the reading :

1. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names (Susunaga).
2. JBORS. I. 67-88. Śaiśunāga Chronology by K. P. Jayaswal.
3. P. T. p. 22 n. 43.
4. AIHT, p. 179.

Śatāni trīṇi varṣāṇi ṣaṣtivarṣādhikāni tu/

can mean hundred, three, plus sixty (163), if the construction is supposed to be a Prakrit arrangement, though it would mean 360 if taken as literary Sanskrit; moreover, 163 is a probable figure while 360 is an impossible one. The Vāyu generally reads:

Śatāni trīṇi varṣāni dviṣaṣṭyabhyadhikāni tu/

'The only tenable construction is to read the Vāyu text as correct Sanskrit meaning[2] 362." It is doubtful if the sources of the present Purāṇas were originally in Prakrit, and even if it is admitted it cannot appeal to reason why *śata* should be used in plural unless the plural was intended there. The Vāyu and Viṣṇu give 362 as against 360 years of the Matsya, Bḍ, and Bhāg. The figure 362 is exact while 360 is round, and so the former should be accepted, and we do get 362 years by consulting the different copies of the texts. 'The individual figures have become corrupt in the course of over 2,000 years of copying. But fortunately some manuscripts yet retain some figures correctly and we have also the data of the Pālī chronicles to check these figures.' Moreover, the figure 163 goes against the average of 20 years accepted by Pargiter per king and it does not fit in his ten kings for we get 200 years for the dynasty; whereas if we accept the figure 362 it almost fits in the 12 kings of the dynasty at the rate of 30 years per king.

Dynasty.

According to Dr. H. C. Raichodhury,[3] 'Bimbisāra of the Haryaṅkakula was followed by Ajātaśatru, Udayī, Aniruddha, Muṇḍa, and Nāgadāsaka who all belonged to the Haryaṅka Dynasty. This Haryaṅka dynasty was followed by the Śiśūnāga dynasty of which Śiśunāga was the first king and he was follow-

1. Ibid, p. 22.
2. P. T. Introduction, para. 42.
3. PHAI, p. 157 et. seq.

ed by Kālāśoka and his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously'. But this view of Dr. Raichodhury is due to the misconception of the Pradyotas. It has been shown that the Pradyota dynasty of Ujjayinī came many centuries after the Pradyota dynasty of Magadha. Dr. Raichodhury does not make clear as to what 'ancestral throne' is meant but Geiger[1] says explicitly that Bimbisāra was not the founder of the dynasty to which he belonged. Moreover, the word Haryaṅkakula of Aśvaghoṣa literally means 'the dynasty whose insignia is a lion', an explanation confirmed by Tibetan authorities. The lion-insignia was chosen on account of the intimate connection of Śiśunāga and his dynasty with Vaiśālī where Śiśunāga was brought up. And hence the view of Dr. Raichodhury cannot be entertained against the Purāṇic statement that Bimbisāra was in the dynasty of Śiśunāga who was the founder of the dynasty named after him.

KINGS OF THE DYNASTY.

1. *Siśunāga.*

'Since the Pradyotas were unpopular for they had forcibly come to the throne, and perhaps there was no heir to succeed, it is very likely that the reigning king of Kāśī, who belonged to a proud house, was invited by the Magadhans to fill the vacant throne. He is not alleged to have come by force and so annihilated only the glory (and not the family) completely of the Pradyota dynasty. He placed his son on the throne of Benares and made Girivraja his capital'. This means, according to Dr. Bhandarkar,[2] that Śiśunāga made himself master not only of Kosala, but also of Avantī, and this further means that he annexed the Vatsa Kingdom also which lay between Kosala and Avantī. He was thus practically the ruler of the whole northern India except the Punjab and Rajputana.' According to the MV.[3] Tīkā, the infuriated populace deposed the reigning king

1. Translation of Mahāvaṁśa, p. 12.
*2. Indian Culture, Vol. I., p. 16.
3. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, II. 1266.

and placed Śiśunāga on the throne. He reigned for 18 and 10 years according to the MV.[1] and DV.[2] respectively. The Purāṇas ascribe him 40 years unanimously. He reigned from B. C 728 to B. C. 688.

2. *Kākavarṇa.*

It was natural that Śiśunaga's son Kākavarṇa, after the demise of his father, should turn his attention to the Punjab with a view to expand the Magadhan empire. Bāṇa[3] says 'Kākavarṇa was carried away somewhere on an artificial aerial car made by the Yavanas subdued by his power, and his throat was cut by a knife on the outskirts of Nagara.' The gloss informs us that Kākavarṇa conquered the Yavanas and received some Yavana individuals as a present. One day the Yavanas took him to their country on an aeroplane and there they killed him. The place where he was killed is referred to as Nagara. This Nagara may be identified[4] with the capital of the Greek kingdom, situated on the southern bank of the Kabul river not far from Jalalabad. This Nagara is referred to in a Kharoṣṭhī inscription[5].

When Kākavarṇa ruled, he did not find it a difficult task to conquer Gāndhāra. So his dominion extended from Magadha to the Kabul river. But after the treacherous death of Kākavarṇa, the Śiśunāga Empire shrank under the weak rule of Kṣemadharman, and it did not attain full splendour before Bimbisāra and even he could not annex the Punjab.

The Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa[6] speaks of a king Kākakarṇa who ruled over Kīkaṭa. He was ever devoted to the welfare of his subjects, and he hated the Brāhmaṇas. He expressed great concern at his death-bed for his kingdom and his minor sons and appointed a friend to protect them after his death. Hence, according

1. MV. IV. 6.
2. DV. V. 98.
3. Haraṣacarita Ch. VI., p. 199, and Saṁkara's commentary thereon.
4. De. p. 135.
5. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol. II, Part I, pp. 45 and 48. 'Mathura Lion Capital Inscription.
6. Madhyakhaṇḍa, XXVI, 20-8

D. C. Sarkar,[1] it would seem that Kākakarṇa is probably a clerical mistake for Kākavarṇa.

Dr. Bhandarkar identifies Kākavarṇin with Kālāśoka, but this is untenable for Nandivardhana is really the Kālāśoka of the Buddhists. The Vāyu, Mt., and Bḍ. give 86 years whereas a copy of the Mt. gives 26 years only which is accepted by KPJ. His rule lasted from B. C. 688 to B. C. 662. He is variously called Kārṣṇivarṇa, Śakavarṇa, and Savarṇa by the Purāṇas.

3. *Kṣemadharman.*

'Kṣemadharman, the successor of Kākavarṇa in the Pūrāṇas, would also have claim to credence in consequence of the general confirmation of the Purāṇic tradition from Buddhist literature.' The Kaliyugarājavritānta calls him Kṣemaka and gives him a reign of 26 years. The Vāyu and Bḍ. give him a reign of 20 years only which is accepted by KPJ. whereas Mt. assigns him 36 years which is accepted by Pargiter. He is called Kṣemadhanvā and Kṣemavarmā also by the Purāṇas.

4. *Kṣemavit.*

Tārānātha[2] calls him Kṣemadarśin, the perceiver of kṣema (=welfare), and he may be Kṣemavit 'knower of kṣema' of the Purāṇas and so he is known to the Buddhist writers He was the son (cf. Kṣetradharmaja.) and the successor of Kṣetradharmā. He is called Kṣetrajña, Kṣemārci, Hemajit. and Kṣatrauja. The dMt. gives him 24 years while all the Purāṇas assign him 40 years.

5. *Bimbisāra.*

Bimbisāra was born in B. C. 618 and came to the throne in B. C. 602 when he was 16 years old. He was converted by

1. Indian Culture, VII, 225.
2. Tārānātha steadily cites his authorities and shows a historical feeling. His lists of kings are full and contain many names not known otherwise. His 'History of Buddhism' was composed in 1603 A. C. See. I. A. 1875, pp. 101 and 361.

Buddha in B. C. 587. It is not certain if he was the son of Kṣemavit, for his father is called Bhaṭiya according to the Ceylonese and Mahapadum according to the Tibetan sources and his mother is Bimbī. Before ascending the throne, he took a great fancy to a park belonging to a householder of Rājagṛha. The prince confiscated it, when he became the king.[1]

'The most important factors in the political history of the period were the four great kingdoms of Kosala, Vatsa, Avantī, and Magadha ruled over by Prasenajit, Udayana, Pradyota (Caṇḍa) and Bimbisāra. Bimbisāra, the real founder of the Magadhan imperial power, strengthened his position by matrimonial alliances with the powerful neighbouring states.[2]' He married Kosaladevī, the sister of Prasenajit, who gave him the district of Kāśī producing a revenue of 1,00,000 coins as her bath money. The Śiśunāgas made strenuous efforts to save their Kāśī which was taken over by the Ikṣvākus of Kosala during weak days of Kṣemavit (B. C. 642 to B. C. 602). Benares was recovered in consequence of a political marriage. He also married Vāsavī, the niece of Gopāla, Cellanā—the daughter of Ceṭaka, and Ambāpālī as a kept who gave birth to Abhaya.' These marriages paved the way for the expansion of Magadha both westwards and northwards and now he could devote his undivided attention to Aṅga which was taken over with the help of the Nāgas of Chotānagpur with whom a permanent friendship was sealed. Thus his empire extended from Banaras to the Bay of Bengal and from Jhārakhaṇḍa to the southern bank of the Ganges.

Family

His chief queen was Kośaladevī—the mother of Ajātaśatru according to the Buddhists,[3] but the Jainas ascribe this honour to Cellanā who bore Koṇika who is identified with Ajātaśatru. Ajātaśatru's mother, when pregnant, desired to drink the blood

1. Rockhill, p. 43.
2. Buddhist India, p. 8.
3. Divyāvadāna, p. 546.

of her husband's right thigh. His wife Kṣemā was the daughter of Madra king. She was so much infatuated with her beauty that she would not visit Buddha lest he should speak disparagingly of it. She visited the Buddha in the Vilvavana[1] and she became a nun. He had a beautiful courtesan Padmāvatī from Ujjayinī. Cellanā had three sons Koṇika, Halla and Vehalla. His other sons were Abhaya, Nandisena, Meghakumāra, Vimala, Kondanna, Sīlava, Jayasena and Cuṇḍa. He had a daughter Cuṇḍī who was given 500 chariots for her use.

Devotion to Buddha.

The Buddha refused the king's offer of his kingdom. When Buddha visited Rājagṛha after his enlightenment, Bimbisāra visited him with 12 *nahutas*[2] of householders to pay him respects. From this moment onwards till his death, he did all in his power to help on the new religion and to further its growth. He set an example to his subjects by taking the vow of abstinence from sexual enjoyments on the six days of each month.[3] His affection for the Buddha was unbounded. When Buddha agreed to visit Vaiśālī, the king repaired the whole road from Rājagṛha to the Ganges. He erected rest houses at the end of each league and spread flowers of different colours knee-deep along the whole route. The king himself accompanied the Buddha to look after his comforts and followed his boat into the water up to his neck. When the Buddha had gone, he set up an encampment on the river bank, awaiting his return. He then escorted him back to Rājagṛha with similar pomp and ceremony.

1. Most of the scholars have translated the word *veluvana* as 'bamboo-grove'. But the Pali Dictionary (Childers) gives *vilava* as the Sanskrit equivalent of Velu. Fragrance and the healthy surroundings of the *vilva* plants are well known.

2. Mahānāradakassapa Jātaka (No. 544). Nahuta=one followed by 28 ciphers (Childer's Pali Language Distionary). Here the significant unit was himself followed by 28 other householders who were ecliped by him and so equal to cyphers in importance. Thus he was followed by 336 (12 x 28) men.

3. Vinaya Piṭaka, 75 (Rāhula Ed). Cf. Manu. IV. 128.

He was no less zealous for his patronage to the Jainas—a characteristic of a great king who should equally patronise all the religions or sects in his state with an equal eye. Once when it was severely cold the king went with queen Cellanā to worship Mahāvīra.[1] Some of his sons e. g., Nandisena and Meghakumāra and others joined the order of Mahāvīra.

Splendour.

His kingdom was three hundred leagues in extent and it included 80,000 villages, the overseers (gāmikas) of which used to meet in a great assembly. He had five persons of unbounded wealth (*amitabhoga*) in his kingdom. King Prasenajit had none in his kingdom. He requested Bimbisāra for one. The request was granted and one Dhanañjaya, son of Meṇḍaka was sent to Kosala.[2] He maintained friendly relations with other kings e.g., Pukkasati of Takkasilā, Pajjota of Ujjayinī and Rūdrāyaṇa of Roruka. Śoṇa, Kolviṣa and Koliya were his ministers, and Kumbhaghoṣaka his treasurer. Jīvaka was his state physician who cured the king of fistula.

He is called Paṇḍaraketu and so he had a white banner with the insignia of a lion (haryaṅka[3]—as the Tibeten explains sen-ges mean-pai) on it. 'He is generally referred to as Senīya Bimbisāra. Senīya is explained as 'possessed of a large following' or 'belonging to the Seniya gotra, and Bimbisara means 'of golden colour'. If Śreṇika[4] is really the correct representation of Seniya, it would mean 'Bimbisāra, the military king'. The Kārṣāpaṇa was the standard of money at Rājagṛha in his days. He abolished the ferry-fee[5] for all ascetics. He bore the title of Devānupiya[6] also.

1. Triṣaṣṭhiśalākācarita, Ch X.
2. Vinaya Piṭaka, pp. 247 et seq.
3. Buddhacarita, XI, 2.
4. Buddhacarita, XV, 100,
5. Divyāvadāna, p. 146.
6. I. A. 1881, p. 108, Aupapatika Sùtra.

Sad End.

The king loved Sīlava most and wanted to make him his heir-apparent, but his attempts were frustrated. Sīlava was going to be killed when he was rescued by Moggallana and he turned a monk. In fact it was the curse of the hated poligamy, the licensed concubinage and the chartered libertinism that brought about the catastrophe. It seems that when the king grew old, there was a war of succession, as amongst the sons of Shahjahan, in which Ajātaśatru came out successful with the help of Devadatta and his associates. Devadatta said to Ajātaśatru.[1] "In former days, prince ! people were long-lived, but now their term of life is short. It is quite possible, therefore, that you may complete your time while you are still a prince. So do kill your father and become the Rājā, and I will kill the Blessed one and become the Buddha". It seems in the war of succession, Ajātaśatru had the upper hand and Bimbisāra abdicated in his favour, but Devadatta chided Ajātaśatru for a fool and said, "You are like a man who puts a skin over a drum with a rat in it" and urged Ajātaśatru to put an end to Bimbisāra.

It was decided, that he should be starved to death. He was imprisoned in a hot house and none but the mother of Ajātaśatru could visit him there. She attended on her dear old husband, 67 years old, as long as she could, like a devoted Indian wife, just as Jahānārā attended upon her father in the fort on the bank of the Yamunā. She fed him in whatever ways she could, but when her visit was stopped, the king continued to live by walking about his cell in meditation. Ajātaśatru sent barbers to cut open his feet, fill the wounds with salt and vinegar and burn them with coals. Bimbisāra let them do their work and soon afterwards he died.[2]

1. S. B. E., XX, p. 241.
2. Rockhill, pp. 90-1.

The Jaina version[1] tries to minimise the crime but the fact remains that it was his son who was responsible for ending his life. The death of Ajātaśatru's mother, shortly after Bimbisāra, gave rise to protracted war with Kosala.

Reign.

'The Mt., gives him 28 years and the balance 23 years (9 for Kāṇvāyana and 14 for Bhūmimitra) are distributed over to other names between Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, imported from the Kāṇvāyana list. The appearance of the figure 24 in some MSS. of the Mt. just above Bimbisāra (28+24=52 probably resulted from a similar confusion'. The Mt. alone gives the figure which approximates the year given to Bimbisāra in Pāli chronicles[2] i.e. 52 years; and it helps us in reaching the aggregate 362. He is variously called Vindhisāra, Vindumāna and Vindhyasena by the Purāṇas.

6. *Ajātaśatru.*

Ajātaśatru helped Devadatta[3] the qoundam disciple and bitter foe of Buddha in several of the latter's attempt to kill the Buddha. Later he was filled with remorse for the past misdeeds and he confessed in circa 547 B. C.; and henceforth he became a loyal adherent of the faith. When Buddha died[4] in B. C. 543, the ministers of Ajātaśatru did not tell him the news at once, lest he should die of a broken heart. When he came to know of it, he was very sorry and sent messengers to claim his share of the Buddha's relics. Two months afterwards the First Council was held in B. C. 543 under his royal patronage and he assisted the monks who took part in it with all his power.

1. C. J. Shah's History of Jainism.
2. MV. II. 25.
3. Khaṇḍahāla Jātaka (No. 542).
4. See Bhāratiya Vidyā, Vol. VIII, pp. 220-38 "Date of Lord Buddha, 1,793 B. C," for the different dates of Nirvāṇa.

When Ajātaśatru found that Prasenajit discontinued the revenue of the Kāśī district after the death of the former's mother, he declared war upon the latter. At first he was victorious in three battles, but later on he was defeated by Prasenajit who took him a prisoner. On giving an undertaking not to resort to violence again, he was released and to seal the friendship, Prasenajit gave him his daughter Vajirā as his wife and the revenue of the disputed district as her batlf-money. Caṇḍa Pajjota also made preparations for a war on Ajātaśatru, but when peace was made with Kosala, he returned back.

About a year before Buddha's death, Ajātaśatru sent his minister Vassakāra to find out from Buddha his chances of victory. Vassakāra was greatly instrumental for the overthrow of the Licchavīs in B.C. 525.

According to the Dhammapada Ṭīkā,[1] Ajātaśatru buried 500 Nigaṇṭhas waist-deep in pits dug in the palace court and had their heads ploughed off, for they had incited the people to kill Moggallāna.

According to Smith,[2] Ajātaśatru carried his victorious arms to the natural limits, the foot of the mountains, and from this time the whole region between the Ganges and the Himālayas became subject directly to the suzerainty of Magadha'. But according to the Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūlakalpa[3] he was 'the king of Aṅga and Magadha upto Vārāṇasī and in the north upto Vaiśālī.'

Statue.

There[4] is a mutilated colossal standing statute of a male found at Parkham in Mathura district and now in the Mathurā Museum. The material is polished grey sandstone similar to that used for the Aśokan pillars. The height, including pedestal,

1. Dhammapada III, 66 (Dictionary of Pali Names, I. 35.)
2. Early History of India, p. 37.
3. Jayaswal's Imperial History, p. 10.
4. V. A. Smith's History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, p. 64.

is 8 feet 8 inches, and the breadth across the shoulders is 2 feet 8 inches. The excessively bulky body is clothed in a waist cloth (dhotī) held round the loins by means of a flat girdle tied in a knot in front. A second flat girdle is bound round the chest. The ornaments are a necklace and a torque from which four tassels hang down on the back.

There is a great controversy whether the two Patna statues —at present in the Indian Museum, Calcutta—and the Parkham statue in the Mathura Museum of Archaeology, are the statues of Yakṣas as held by older archaeologists, or they are the portrait statues of the three Śiśunāga kings. The latter view has been contested on the ground that the names of the kings are not traceable on the statues. Moreover O. C. Ganguli[1] is of the opinion that the three statues resemble Maṇibhadra the Yakṣa—a popular deity in eastern India—too closely to be anything but Yakṣa statues. According to K. P. Jayswal I the letters are most archaic and differ strikingly from the Aśokan ones. Moreover, the inscription on the Pārkham statue contains the name of a Śiśunāga king whose both names Kuṇika and Ajātaśatru are given and so it is a portrait-statue meant to be deposited in the royal gallery.

Jayaswal's readings and interpretations were accepted in principle by veterans like H. P. Śāstri, G. H. Ojha and R. D. Banerji. Even V. A. Smith expressed his agreement with K. P. Jayswal on this vexed problem. He was of the opinion that the statues are pre-Mauryan, that probably they were executed not later than B. C. 400, and the inscriptions are contemporary with the statues. But Dr. L. D. Barnett and R. P. Chanda[2] expressed their disagreement. The various readings suggested by distinguished scholars do not help us to get at the exact meanings of the inscriptions whereas Jayaswal's readings are most instructive and helpful in reconstructing the lost history of ancient India especially

1. Modern Review, October, 1919.
2. JDL., Vol. IV, pp. 47-84. 'Four Ancient Yakṣa Statues'.

of the Śiśunāga period. Dr. Raichodhury thinks that the problem must be regarded as not yet definitely solved. The general opinion that they are Yakṣa statues is untenable for we do not know what the Yakṣas really are, although the AMSMK.[1] calls Kaniṣka's dynasty[2] as that of the Yakṣas but these flourished in the first century A. C. and the letters and the high polish unquestionably go to prove that the statues are pre-Mauryan.

Reading.

According to K. P. Jayswal[3] the statue of Ajātaśatru bears the following inscriptions[4] :

Nibhadapra Śeni Aj (ā) satru rājo (si) r (i) [Right]

Kuṇika-Śevāsināgo Māgadhānam rājā. [Left]

(Symbols for) 4, 20 (tha), (ḍ). 8 (hi or hri). [Front]

The passed-away one, the descendant of Śreṇī, Ajātaśatru king, Srī Kuṇika Śevasi-nāga, King of the Magadhan people. 24 (years) 8 (months) 10 days (reign period).

If this inscription may be supposed to be dated in the Buddha Era, it would seem that King Ajātaśatru who was a great devotee of the Lord, got his statue prepared just when his end was approaching and the letters were inscribed on it, immediately after his death on his statue. By subtraction we get B. C. 519 (543-24) when Ajātaśatru ceased to rule. So we may say that after being inscribed, it was added to the royal gallery in B. C. 518. Perhaps the statue was removed to Mathurā in the time of Kaniṣka who carried away so many trophies from Magadha.

Reign.

He reigned for 25 years according to the Brahmāṇḍa and Vāyu which is accepted by Pargiter. Matsya, Mahāvaṁśa

1. Jayaswal's Imperial History. pp. 19-20.
2. ABORI, Poona, Vol. XXX, pp. 316-25.
3. JBORS, Vol. V, p. 550. Another Saisunaka Statue.
4. Vogel's reading is : (ni) Bhadapugarina (ga) aṭha......pi Kuni (ka) te vāsinā (Gomitakena) katā.

And Sten Konow reads: "Om Bhadapugarikā ga raña aṭha he te vāninā gomātakena katā.

and the Burmese tradition ascribe him 27, 32, and 85 years respectively. K. P. Jayswal accepts 35 years on the authority of Brahmāṇḍa., but we do not know as to what MS. or edition of the Purāṇa he is referring to. It is not attested by any of the MSS. consulted by Pargiter in his text. He reigned for 32 years for Buddha expired in the eighth year of Ajātaśatru and Ajātaśatru got the statue prepared in the 24th year of Nirvāna and it was inscribed shortly after his death. He ruled from B. C. 551 to B. C. 519.

7. *Darśaka*

Pradhāna rejects Darśaka, for the Buddhist and Jaina traditions assert that Udayī[1] and not Darśaka was the son and immediate successor of Ajātaśatru. But the reality of his existence is established by Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa (IV century B. C.) where he is called the brother-in-law of Udayana of Vatsa. According to K. P. Jayaswal 'the Pāli Nāgadāsaka is the Purāṇic Darśaka. Darśaka, the chief of the Vinaya, who is a great figure in southern Buddhist history, is treated as a contemporary of his namesake Dāsaka, the king. To avoid confusion, early writers seem to have introduced the practice of adding the distinguishing dynastic name Śiśunāga to the name of the king. Tārānāthās, Darśaka would correspond with Subāhu, the son of Ajātaśatru. He reigned for 25, 35, 24, and 4 years according to the Vāyu, Matsya, Dīpavaṁśa, and the Burmese tradition respectively. The Ceylonese authority wrongly calls him the son of Muṇḍa and says that the people deposed him and made Śiśunāga the king in his place.

Bhandarkar[2] also accepts the identification of Darśaka with Nāgadāsaka. But he doubts the story of Bhāsa as Udayana must have been at least 56 years old if he married Padmāvatī—the sister of Darśakā, Ajātaśatru's son. But there is nothing inconsistent if a man 60 years old married a damsel of 16 or

1. Cf. Koṇikaḥ mṛtas tadā rājānaṁ Udayinam sthāpayanti. Āvaśyaka Sūtrā, 687.
2 Charmichel Lectures, 1918-19, pp 69-70,

so. We find the old king Prasenajit[1] marrying a Seth's beautiful daughter 16 years old of her own free will after his return from the battle-field against Ajātaśatru. Darśaka was probably the youngest brother of Ajātaśatru.

8. *Udayī*

Ajātaśatru, according to the MV., was murdered by his son Udayibhadra but the Sthavirāvalicarita informs us that Udayin was overpowered with sorrow at the death of his father Ajātaśatru and transferred his capital from Campā to Pāṭaliputra. The story of successive parricides from Ajātaśatru to Nāgadāsaka is only an exaggeration of the crime of the former. Smith,[2] however, refers to the analogy of Parthian history which knows of three successive parricide princes, viz. Orodes, Phraates IV and Phraates V. Udayin did not succeed Ajātaśatru and, therefore, could not have killed him. The Gārgīsaṁhitā calls him 'Udayin the good' (dharmātmā). The Jaina tradition is confirmed by the Vāyu which says that Udayin built the city of Kusumapura in the fourth year of his reign i.e. in B. C. 481. The choice of Pāṭaliputra was probably due to its position in the centre of the realm. Moreover, its situation on the confluence of the Ganges and Śoṇa was important from the commercial as well as the strategic point of view. He was murdered by some prince, whose father had been deposed by him, in the guise of a monk. He ruled for 33 years according to the Vā, Br., and Mt. The Buddhists call him Udayibhadda who reigned for 16 years. The reigns of the two rulers Aniruddha and Muṇḍa are included in the reign of Udayin who is assigned 33 against 16 of the Pāli records. The figure 33 was made up as follows:—

16 years	Udayin.
9 ,,	Aniruddha.
8 ,,	Muṇḍa
33 years.	

1. Jātaka III, 405-6.
2. E. H. I. (4th Ed.), p. 36 n. 2.

He had regards for the Buddha's teaching, and had it reduced to writing.[1]

Statue.

'The easy attitude and the calm and dignified repose of the figure is still conspicuous and claims for it a high place amongst the best specimens of early Indian art'[2]. The scholarly world is highly indebted to the late K. P. Jayaswal who identified the statue[3] which long remained neglected. He reads[4] it as:—

Bhage Aco Chonīdhīśe.

(His Gracious Majesty Aja, King, Over-Ruler of the land). King Udayin had, according to the sculptor, a double chin. He wore hair done and decorated according to some definite style, but he was clean shaven. He was on the evidence of the statue 6 ft. in height. Udayī is called Ajaka or Aja also by the Purāṇas. Aja and Udayī both mean the 'sun'. The statue has most of the articles of dress as given by Kātyāyana to a Vrātya.[5]

9. *Aniruddha.*

'According to the Mahāvaṁśa[6] he killed his father Udayabhaddaka and was himself slain by Muṇḍa. The 18 years of MV. given to Susunāga (against 10 of the DV.) probably represents the 8 years for Aniruddh. Tārānātha's Mahendra with 9 years probably corresponds with Aniruddha.'

1. K. P. Jayaswal's Imperial History, p.10.
2. Cunningham, Archaeological Survey Report, Vol. IXV, pp. 2-3.
3. JBORS, Vol. V, pp. 88-106; 516-542.
4. Barnett reads : 'Bhage ace chanivike.', but as to its interpretation he ventured no opinion.

R. P. Chanda's reading is : 'Bha (?) ga accha nivika' (the owner of inexhaustible capital i. e. Vaiśravaṇa) I. A. 1919, p. 28).

Dr. R. C. Mazumdar reads : Gate (yakhe (?) Lecchai (vi) 40, 4 (the year 44 of the Licchavīs having expired). I. A., 1919, p. 32.).

5. JBORS. 1919, pp. 552-565. Śiśunaga Statues by H. P. Śāstrī.
6. MV. IV. 2-3.

10. *Muṇḍa.*

He is mentioned in the Anguttara Nikāya[1] as reigning at Pāṭaliputra and as such he would necessarily come after Udayin who founded the city of Pāṭaliputra. When his wife Bhaddā died, he gave himself up to complete despair and mummified the queen's body. The king's treasurer Piyaka took Nārada to him and his sorrow vanished by his preachings. He is identified with Camasa of Tārānātha. He was deposed in favour of Nandivardhana (=Kālāśoka) for Tārānātha expressly says that Kānāsoka of Champaran was chosen king of Magadha in preference to 12 sons of Camasa (Muṇḍa ?). He reigned for 8 years from B. C. 459 to B. C. 451.

11. *Nantivardhana.*

This Nandivardhana is to be identified with the Kālāśoka for the date of the Second Buddhist Council, which, according to the Pālī works[2], was held about 100 years after the Nirvāṇa under Kālāśoka with all its variations except one (Tibetan 160 A. B.), falls within the reign of Nandivardhana. Moreover, Tārānātha says that Yaśaś held a Congress of 700 bhikṣus at the Kusumapurī Vihāra in Vesālī under the patronage of king Nandin. Yaśas name is prominently associated with the Second Congress. The Pālī authorities call the king Kālāśoka, and Tārānātha calls him Nandin. It appears that *vardhana* (increaser) was a posthumous title given by history to Nandin. 'Hemacandra says that 'Nanda' succeeded Udayin and he was anointed 60 years after the Nirvana of Lord Mahāvira. This would place his accession in B.C 467 (527-60) and Udayī ceased to rule in B. C. 469. If the rule of Aniruddha and Muṇḍa is supposed to be non-existent, then only it may be said that he came to rule 60 years approximately after the Nirvāna of Mahāvīra. The Second Congress of Buddhists was held at Vaiśālī where the heretics were defeated in B. C. 440 i. e. 103 years after the Nirvāṇa of the Lord Buddha. The Divyāvadāna

1. Anguttara Nikāya, III, 57.
2. Mahāvaṁśa iv, 7.

calls him Sahlin (=Saṁhārin—the killer). This agrees with Tārānātha who describes him as a great destroyer of life.

Statue.

It bears the following inscriptions[1]:—

Sapa khate Vaṭa Nandi (Of all rulers the chief Nandī). The imperial Nandī was broader, fatter, and taller by a few inches than Udayī. Varta also means steel and the name may have been given to him by his parents probably owing to his great physical strength; his powerful, iron physique is evident from the statue.

According to K. P. Jayaswal[2], Muṇḍā and Aniruddha were elder brothers of Nandī. The Bhāgavata gives him the patronymic Ājeya. Matsya and Brahmāṇḍa give him 40 years in a round figure, but the Vāyu gives him 42 years which I accept being an odd number.

Language of Inscriptions.

The language of three inscriptions, though so short, is the vernacular found in the Canonical Pāli. So a vernacular, call it Pālī, Prakrit, Apabhraṁśa, or Māgadhī,—and not Sanskrit seems to have been the official language[3] under the Śiśunāgas. This is also suggested by Rājaśekhara[4] (IX century A. C.) who

1 Prof R. D Banerji reads: 'ba' instead of 'pa'. JBORS, V, 211.
R.P. Chanda reads; 'Yakha sa (?) rvatanamdi'. I. A. 1919. p. 27.
R. C. Mazumdar : Yakhe saṁ Vajinam 70' (The figure of a Yakṣa (made) in the year 70 of the Vajjis) and so the inscription would belong to A. C. 180 (110—70) (*Dynastic History of Northern India*, (Vol. I. p 188. by H C. Ray). Dr. Mazumdar and Chanda are of the opinion that the statues belong to the Kuṣāṇa period of Indian History. (I. A. 1919, pp. 33-6).

There seems to be no justification for taking A. C. 110 as the epoch of the Lichchavī Era. But if we take for granted that the initial year of the Lichchavī Era (if there did exist any, which is doubtful) coincided with the downfall of the Lichchavīs, it may be suggested that the statue belongs to B.C 455 (525—70); and that of the so-called Udayī belongs to B. C. 481 (525-44). On this assumption, the statues would belong definitely to the pre-Mauryan period.

2. J. B. O. R. S., iv, 38.

3. JBORS, V, 98.

4. Kāvyamīmāṁsā, p. 50 (Gaikwad Oriental Series).
Journal American Oriental Society, 1925, p. 72.

says that 'in Māgadha a king named Śiśunāga prescribed for his harem a rule excluding the eight letters (ṭa, ṭha, ḍa, ḍha, śa, ṣa, ha, & kṣa) as being difficult to pronounce.

12. *Mahānandī*

The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa[1] gives the form Mahānandi and asserts that he was a contemporary of Kātyāyanā. According to Tārānātha (p. 553), Nanda, the father of Mahāpadma, was a friend of Pāṇini. He also says that 'Nanda had king Pilu of the Piśācas in his power' (p. 55). So we may take him to mean that Mahānandin's political influence extended to the North-West frontier of India.

The name Tulakuci which occurs in the Divyāvadāna after Sahlin is identical with Mahānandī. Tulakuci is spelt in the metrical Divyāvadāna as Turakuri. Its only possible restoration in Sanskrit is Turakuḍi (=one of swift body). This may be his proper name or only a description of his. He ruled for 43 years from B.C. 409 to B. C. 366.

We find that after the Great Indian War, there were only small principalities here and there and imperialism was given a hard blow Kingship had been established in Magadha long before the War and it continued for more than a thousand years and became stronger day by day. There was always a tendency to establish an empire at the cost of the neighbouring states. The rulers were not satisfied with their own small principalities but constant warfare and strategy were the common affairs of the day. Boundaries were changing, kings were assassinated, and sometimes the presidents of the republics combined to protect themselves against the aggression of the mighty. But they were too weak to hold their own against the sovereign of a big empire and at last they succumbed to him. In course of time Nanda became the master of practically the whole of India and Magadha a great empire.

1. Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, II. 5-10.

CHAPTER XII.

PARĪKṢIT AND NANDA.

The following stanza is found invariably to specify the interval between Parīkṣit and Nanda in the Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas[1] :—

Mahāpadm[2]-ābhiṣekāt[3] tu yāvaj janma[4] Parīkṣitaḥ
Evaṁ[5] varṣ ı[6]-sahasraṁ tu jñeyaṁ[7] pañcāsad-uttara[8]//

(Now from Mahāpadma's inauguration to Parīkṣit's birth, this interval is indeed known as 1,050 years. P. T. 74.)

The above verse has almost become a riddle for the historians to solve for ascertaining the date of the Great Indian War, Parīkṣit being the son of Abhimanyu who lost his life fighting to the last in the Bhárata battle waged on the field of Kurukṣetra between the sons of Dhṛtarāṣtra and Pāṇḍu. It was during this battle that Uttarā, the wife of Abhimanyu, gave birth to a still-born child after six months' gestation owing to the shock she had received on hearing the sad news of the death of her husband, who was killed treacherously by the combination of seven chiefs against him. This tragic death of Abhimanyu was the subject of popular legend with the Hindus. Thus the two important events, the birth of Parīkṣita who was resuscitated by the divine powers of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and the coronation of Yudhiṣthira, the Virtuous, were naturally

1. Viṣhṇu Purāṇa IV, 24.33; Bhāgavata XII. 2. 36.

2. Mt. & Bd. Mahānand—, Vā. Mahādev—, which both no doubt- Mahāpadma—.

3. Bḍ. °ṣekāntam.

4. Vā., Bḍ. janma yāvat.

5. lnMt. ekam; kVṣ. ete : others etad.

6 celnMt, eva; bMt. eka.

7. Bhāg. śatam; jBhāg. śatam.

8. cejMt °śat-ottaram, bMt. °. śato trayam : lnMt., blVṣ. pañca-śatottaram. But eVā., Vṣ., Bhāg. pañcadaś-ottaram.

the most appropriate events for fixing the starting point of the historical epoch. The above verse has been differently interpreted to mean 515; 550; 850; 951; 1,015; 1,050; 1,115; 1,500; 1,503; 1,510; or 2,500.

Pargiter's Theory Explained.

It has been suggested by a distinguished Indologist[1] that the date of the Bhārata War as advocated by Pargiter would be amply supported if the reading '*sahasraṁ tu*' in the third foot is supposed to be wrong for '*sahasrārdham*'; and by so doing no syllable would be superfluous. Here the reading '*tu*' is an unnecessary addition to complete the pāda, whereas if we can amend the text as '*sahasrārdham*' it gives a rendering which would justify approximately the date of the Bhārata War as established by Pargiter. On this supposition Parīkṣit's birth or the war would be dated in B. C. 930 (415+515) or B. C. 965 (415+550), thereby placing the coronation of Nanda in B. C. 415. This would reduce the reign of the Nandas from 100 to 90 years, reserving 10 years for the subjugation of the contemporary kings though Pargiter would reserve 20 years for it. But though the amended texts suits Pargiter's approximate date[2] of B.C. 950, yet the reading as proposed to be amended has no backing of any extant MSS. as attested by the distinguished antiquarian in his learned text, and we should change no reading so long as an intelligible account can be constructed on the existing texts. Moreover, Pargiter himself accepts 1,408 (940+138+330) or 938 (723+52+163) years as the highest or the lowest duration[3] of the dynasties that ruled during the interval of Parīkṣit and Nanda.

1. I am indebted to my Professor Dr. S. C. Sarkar, who happens to be a pupil of the late learned writer of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, for his kind permission to give publicity and discuss his views in this connection.

2. AIHT., p. 182.

3. Ibid, p. 179.

850 *years.*

Dr. Shamasastry[1] says that the interval between Parīkṣit and Nanda is one thousand years less by one hundred fifty (i.e. 850) years. Perhaps the reading in his text was 'nyūnam' instead of 'jñeyam' in the fourth foot. But this hardly suits the dynastic aggregate. Mr. V. T. G. Kale[2] thinks that it means 951 (1+1,000−50), and so he places the war in B. C. 1,263 (951+312). He further supports this date by subtracting 1,839 years (6 Manus × 72=432+27$\frac{3}{4}$=459$\frac{3}{4}$ × 4=1839) from B. C. 3,102. But he, like Shamasastry, does not take the dynastic periods into consideration.

1,015 or 1,050 and Jayaswal's Explanation.

According to K. P. Jayaswal when the Purāṇas calculate the date[3] of the Great Indian War with reference to the coronation year of Nanda, they do not mean the last Nanda, but Nanda the Great (Mahānanda). The interval is 1,015 years. Against this date the Vāyu, and Matsya, give 1,050 years. Thus the interval between Parīkṣit and Mahāpadma (1,050) was longer than between Parīkṣit and Nanda (1,015 years, Viṣṇu.) The latter cosequently could not be a Nanda later than Mahāpadma, but he must be an earlier Nanda. According to him the Brahmāṇḍa (III.74.229 Venkaṭeśvara Ed.) reads Mahānanda in the place of Nanda. So the Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, and Bhāgavata give their calculation from the date of the coronation of Mahānanda (1,015 years), and the Vāyu, and Matsya from the coronation of Mahādeva or Mahāpadma.

Thus there is a difference of 35 (1,050-1,015) years between the coronation of the two kings, and the Purāṇas give 43 years for the reign of Mahānanda—a reading taken by K.P. Jayaswal without the backing of any Purāṇic text. The readings are Mahāmnandi (nMt), Mahīnandī (fVā), or Sahanandi (Bḍ).

1. Gavām Ayana—the Vedic Era, By R. Shamasastry, Mysore, 1908.
2. Journal Mythic Society, III, 111-113.
3. JBORS. I. 109.

K P. Jayaswal would explain the discrepancy of 8 years on the ground that Mahāpadma was the *de facto* ruler for 8 years as regent. He would interpret the reading *Mahāpadmābhiṣekāt* as the abhiṣeka of Mahāpadma as regent, and not as a king. Moreover he would call Mahānanda, Nanda II and place his accession in B. C. 409.* Thus according to him

Nanda II (Mahānanda) ruled for 35 years from 409 to 374 B. C.

Nanda III (Mahādeva) ruled for 8 years from 374 to 366 B. C.

Nanda IV (the unnamed minor).

Neo Nandas.

Nanda V (Mahāpadma) ruled for 28 years from 366 to 338 B. C.

Nanda VI (Sumālya), the Greedy „ 12 „ „ 338 „ 326 B. C.

K. P. Jayaswal accepts 697 against 1,001 years of Purāṇas for the Bṛhadrathas and 363 against 362 years of the Purāṇas for the Śiśunāgas, who according to him, were the immediate successors of the Bṛhadrathas. But while preparing his chronology he would assign only 361 years for the Śiśunāgas and would consider the king whose coronation is referred to as Mahānanda II (a king of the Śiśunāgas dynasty), and not of the Nanda dynasty, although all the Purāṇas clearly state that Mahānanda or Mahāpadma refers to Nanda, the Great, who overthrew all his contemporary kings and ruled for 100 years along with his 8 sons. But it is not known that an *abhiṣeka* is performed of a regent and that while counting the regnal years the period of his regency is included in his rule. Moreover, there is to my knowledge, no instance in the history of he world where the period of regency of a minor king has been excluded from his total regnal period. There is nothing to warrant the supposition of a regency under the supposed minor king. We are at a loss to understand the source of his knowledge for this information. K. P. Jayaswal gives us the interval 1,015 (1,424-409)

years or 1,058 (1,424-366) years which include 8 years of regency. (i. e. 1050).

2,500 years.

Prof.[1] D. N. Mukherji reads the last pāda of the verse as: *Evam varṣa sahasram tu jneyam pancaśata trayam*/ and so he takes the verse to mean 2,500 {(1,000 + 1,500 (500×3)}. He accounts for the interval as follows. The rule of the Śiśunāgas began in B. C. 588 (325+100+163); and Nandivardhana (Pradyota) came to the throne in B. C. 608 (588+20). And so the duration was 2,500 (3,101—608) in a round number. He reads the lines 30-34 (P. T. p. 14) to mean that the Bṛhadrathas ruled for 1,723 (1,000+723) years. He brings the evidence of Arrian who says[2], "From the time of Dyonysios to Sandracottos, the Indians counted 153 kings; but among them a republic was thrice established..(lasting) to 300 years and another to 120 years." Moreover he thinks that the line

Bṛhadratheṣvatīteṣu Vītihotreṣv Avantiṣu/

refers to the republics of Vitihotras and Mālavas established in Magadha. Thus he gets {(1,723 of Bṛhadrathas+118 (138-20) of Pradyotas + 300 + 120+239 years the period of the third republic)} 2500 years as the interval.

The Greek evidence does not make clear as to who was Dyonysios. He is sometimes taken to be the fifteenth predecessor of Heracles who is identified with Kṛṣṇa. But the Śūrasenas never ruled in Magadha whereas Sandracottus was a king Magadha. So the Greek evidence is not very clear as to what it really implies. The reading is '*śato trayam*' and not '*śatatrayam*' as he thinks. The other evidences have already been discussed. He would himself place Nandivardhana once in B. C. 608 and again in B. C. 602 which cannot be easily reconciled. The Purāṇas nowhere refer to the existence of a republic in the

1. Pradipa (a Bengali monthly journal), Vol. V, pp. 1-23.
2. Mcrindle, Ancient India as described by Arrian, pp. 203-4.

annals of Magadha as they do about the other quarters. So it would seem that his theory is not worth serious consideration.

Purāṇic Commentators.

All the commentators[1] of the Purāṇas are puzzled over this stanza and they try to explain the verse at length by the use of their critical faculty. They realise that it should mean 1,500 years and nothing else. According to Śrīdhara, the period 1,015 can in no way be accounted for. In fact, the interval between Parīksit and Nanda is one and a half thousand less by two (1,498), for it is stated in the IX Book that 22 kings beginning from Mārjāri of Magadha, the contemporary of Parīkṣit, to Ripuñjaya will rule for one thousand years. Therefore 5 Pradyotas will rule for 138 years and the Śiśunagas will rule the earth for 360 years.

Śrīvīrarāghava repeats the argument of Śrīdhara and says that the verse is intended to ascertain the period as to how long the Lunar dynasty will survive from the date of Parīkiṣt's birth. Nanda's coronation has been referred to because the Lunar dynasty ended with the anointment of Nanda. It means 1,115 years.

According to the Siddhānta Pradīpa of Śukadeva, it means ten added to one thousand years and one hundred multiplied by five, so it comes to 1,510 years. Sahadeva, the son of Jarāsandha, was the contemporary of Abhimanyu, and Mārjāri, the son of Sahadeva, was the contemporary of Parīkṣit. The total of the Bṛhadrathas and Pradyotas is 1,138 (1,000+138)or 1,139, years according to my study of the Bṛhadrathas. The above number of years is clear if we take into account the intervening period between the fall of the Śiśunāga Empire and the coronation of Nanda. There would be discrepancy of number if we do not take the word five as multiplied by five.

1. See the commentaries on the Bhāgavata, XII, 256.

Astronomical Data.

The Purāṇic chroniclers were conscious of the misunderstanding which may arise in course of the countless centuries and hence they adopted a second method of calculation, or rather of checking the first by the second, the astronomical data. All the writers are unanimous that the Saptarṣis were in Maghā at the time of Parikṣit's birth and they would go to Pūrvāṣāḍhā in the time of Nanda. The following stanza is found in the Purāṇas:

Yadā Maghābhyo yāsyanti Pūrvāṣāḍhāṁ maharṣayaḥ /
Tadā Nandāt prabhṛtyeṣa Kalirvrddhiṁ gamiṣyati //

(When the Great Bear passes from the Maghā to Purvāṣāḍhā then starting from Nanda, this Kali age will attain great magnitude. P. T. 75).

Motion of Great Bear.

There is a considerable amount of discussion regarding the peculiar motion ascribed in the Siddhānta and other works to the Saptarṣis or Ursa Major. Professor V. V. Narlikar of Benares Hindu University kindly informed me as follows: 'The earth's axis of rotation now-a-days points approximately to what we call the Pole Star. All constellations appear to be rotating about this star on account of the earth's diurnal rotation. On account of the earth's precession, the axis of rotation itself sweeps out a cone of semi-vertical angle of about 23°.27 in 25,600 years or so (25,868 $\frac{44}{167}$ years to be exact). This would naturally imply an apparent motion of the constellation in the skies. Ursa Major being prominent, its motion became known through ancient records belonging to different epochs separated by thousands of years. The motion of precession being unknown, the varying accounts of the positions and the diurnal motions of Ursa Major must have been interpreted as its proper motion'.

Rate of Motion.

According to the International Conference of Fundamental Studies the rate of precession for 1900 A. C. was 50. 2564″+ 0·02220″ T, as the annual amount, T being the time reckoned from 1900 in centuries. This is the supposed motion of the Ursa Majoris. This is true if the Ursa Majoris can be identified with the summer solstitial colure. D. N. Mookerji attempts to prove[2] that the precessional period, according to the Hindu astronomers, is of 27,000 years. But there is no definite evidence as yet that the ancient Hindu astronomers knew that motion of the Seven Ṛṣis was completed in 27,000 years, although the Matsya and Vāyu would suggest[3] that the motion is completed in 70 divine years and 60 divine months, i. e. 75 divine years which would give 27,000 (75 x360) years. According to Brennand[4] the rate of motion of the solstices, originally known and so near the truth, was lost to the later astronomers who were misled into stating 2,700 years for a revolution instead of 27,000. This is, he would suggest, due to the loss of a cypher or a dot in course of the innumerable centuries. But there can be no question of a zero being lost for the decimal system of notation which uses the symbol cypher can never be so old; although the zero (śūnyam) may be traced back[5] to the days of Piṅgala (C. 200 B. C.). Moreover, the ancient books on astronomy were written either in verse or prose and so there cannot be the least possibility of a zero being lost. Varāhamihira[6] definitely says :

Ekaikasmin Rkśe śataṁ śataṁ te caranti varṣāṇām /

According to Śákalya Muni,[7] the yearly motion of the Seven Ṛṣis is 8 *liptas* or minutes. The modern Sūryasiddhānta,

1. Encyclopaedia Brittanica, Vol. XXII. (XIII Ed), p. 275.
2. Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. V, pp. 290 et seq.
3. Pargiter's Text, p. 60.
4. Hindu Astronomy, by W. Brennand, 1896, pp. 68 et. seq.
5. History of Hindu Mathematics by Drs. B B. Datta and A. N. Singh part I, p. 75 et seq. ; Piṅgala VIII, 29 & 30.
6. Bṛhatsamhitā, Saptarṣi cārāḥ.
7. Siddhāntatattvaviveka of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa (1658 A. C). Bhagrabayutyādhikāra, 25.

as interpreted by the commentators, gives 54" per year as the precession rate. So it would seem that the exact motion of the Seven Ṛṣis is yet a mystery and it is not possible to explain it in the light of modern researches.

Motion is Retrograde.

S. C. Vidyārṇava[1], misled by the regular order of the Nakṣatras, thought that the Saptarṣis also moved in the regular order arranged according to the nakṣatras. K. P. Jayaswal and many thought like this and hence they concluded that there was a difference of 1,015 or 1,050 years only between Parīksita and Nanda. By counting in the regular order we have Maghā, Pūrvā Fālgunī, Uttarā-Fālgunī, Hastā, Citrā, Svātikā, Viśākhā, Anurādhā, Jyeṣṭhā, Mūlā, and Pūrvāṣādhā nakṣatras only, and since the Ṛṣis reside over each nakṣatra for a period of 100 years (according to the Purāṇas and other ancient astronomers), the difference between Parīkṣit and Nanda should be one of eleven hundred years only. Even the Puranic copyisis were led into errors due to this very misunderstanding and they tried to give different readings to equate this astronomical datum. The commentators also lacked the knowledge of astronomy in the majority of cases and hence they did not correct the extant texts and tried to explain it on the authority of dynastic periods only.

But in fact their motion is retrograde as is clear from the very word precession. Kamalākras also says 'pratyabdam prāggatisteṣām'. C. A. Young[2] is also of the same opinion and so their motion is contrary to that of the sun and it is retrograde. Hence if we count the nakṣatras in the reverse order we have Maghá, Aśleṣā, Puṣyā, Punarvasu, Ārdrā, Mṛgaśiras, Rohinī, Kṛttikā, Bharaṇī, Aśvinī, Revatī, Uttarā-Bhādrapadā, Pūrvā-Bhādrapadā, Śatabhiṣā, Dhaniṣṭhā, Śravaṇā, Uttara-Āṣāḍhā and there is thus a clear difference of 16 nakṣatras, if we exclude

1. Matsya Purāṇa, ed. by B. D. Basu, Alld. 1916, appendix II. p. 14.
2. A Text Book of General Astronomy, 1904, p. 141.

Maghā which had already passed away and Pūrvā-Āsāḍhā which had just begun. And so this would give an interval of 1,600 or 1,510 (according to Śukadeva) or 1,501 (Triveda) years to be exact.

Conclusion

Thus the interval between the birth of Paríkṣita and the coronation of Nanda was of 1,501 'or 1,510 years and not of 1,050 or 2,500 years as supposed by many scholars being misled by wrong astronomical notions. I agree with Śukadeva the learned commentator of the Bāhgavata, that there would be discrepancy of number without taking the word five as multiple cejln Matsya and Viṣṇu by five. They read *pañcaśatottaram,* and so the second line of the controversial stanza may be read as;

Etad verṣa sahasraṁ tu jñeyaṁ pañcaśātottaram //

And this reading is warranted by many MSS. also. And 1,501 is the true interval obtained by adding up the periods of the dynasties given by the Purāṇas.

Number of kings.	Dynasties.	Years.
32	Bṛhadrathas	1,001
5	Pradyotas	138
12	Śiśunāgas	362
49		1,501 years.

This would give an average of 30.6 years per king.

1. (A) Mss. of Matrya purāṇa
   (c) Auf. Cat. nos. 813-4 (Bodleian library).
   (e) No. 2032, E. 3545. (India office).
   (j) No. 3347, Jackson collection.
   (l) Sanskrit Ms. No. 164 in Deccan College, Poona.
   (n) Add. 14348. Date 18th cort. (British Museum).
   (B) Mss. of Viṣṇupurāṇa.
   (a) Wilson 120. Auf. Cat. No. 104. Date, early 19th contary.
   (b) Sanskrit MS. No. 110 of 1831-2 (Deccan College, Poona).

CHAPTER XIII

NANDA DYNASTY.

Mahāpadma Nanda or Mahāpadmapati (sovereign of an infinite hoard or immense wealth) was the son of Mahānandī by a Śūdrā woman. The Jaina tradition[1] represents him as the 'son of a courtesan by a barber'. K. P. Jayaswal holds[2] that he was entrusted with the guardianship of the princes. Curtius[3] says : 'His (Agrammes i.e. the last Nanda's) father (i.e. the first Nand) was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who from his being not uncomely in person had gained the affection of the queen, and was by her influence advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death, begot the present king'. The name Agrammes is probably a distorted form of Ugrasena[4] which is the name of the first Nanda according to the Mahābodhīvaṁsa; and not that of Augrasainya (=Augraseni) as Raichodhury supposes.

Accession to Throne.

According to the Jaina account, once[5] Nanda dreamt that the town was surrounded by his entrails and he disclosed his dream to his preceptor who guessing the meaning of the omen, betrothed his daughter to Nanda. The marriage procession took place at the same time when, on the death of Udayin who

1. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan, ed. by H. Jacobi, Cal., 1932, VI. 231—2.
2. JBORS, I, 88.
3. McCrindle's 'The Invasion of India by Alexander', p. 222.
4. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan, VI, 231—46.
5. Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Allahabad, p. 45; 'Kings of Magadha from the Bṛhadhatha till the Mauryas' by K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya.

left no heirs (according to Hemacandra), the five royal insignia were anointed by the ministers and led through the streets. When the two processions met, the state elephant put Nanda on its back and it was evident that the royal insignia themselves pointed him out as the successor of Udayin. He was accordingly proclaimed king and ascended the throne. But the Jainas were perhaps led astray by the confusion of names and their remote connection from the scene of occurence, and hence they wrongly put Mahāpadma as the successor of Udayin. According to the Ārya Manjuśri Mula-kalpa I[1] Mahāpadma Nanda was the prime minister of Magadha before his kingship.

Authority Despised.

A calumny[2] was started by the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas to rouse popular feeling against him, and he was charged with foul play with the late princes. 'Probably a coalition of the ancient ruling houses was formed to remove the usurper of a non-Kṣatriya caste and to undo this precedent of social abnormity'[3]. So he was presented with an occasion 'to uproot all the Kṣatriyas'. Hemacandra[4] also suggests that Nanda's dependent chiefs and guards all refused him the customary respects and they disobeyed him but the disloyal chiefs were immediately put to death by supernatural agencies and thus the king's authority was restored and soon acknowledged throughout his kingdom.

Minister.

Kalpaka,[5] the son of Kapila, was a very learned man. He led a scholarly life and gained the esteem of all citizens. He was forced to marry, much against his will, a Brāhmaṇa girl by

1. Jayaswal's Imperial History, Inrroduction.
2. Pradhan's Chronology, p. 226.
3. JBORS, I, 38—9.
4. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan, VI, 244—52.
5. Ibid, VII, 73—138.

rescuing her from a well where she was cleverly thrown by her father. Nanda wanted to make him his minister, but he could not be induced. The king charged him with murder through a washer-woman and Kalpaka hastened to the king to appease him. He was received by the king most graciously and pressed to be his minister. Under Kalpaka as premier the power and fame of Nanda attained their meridian.

But the predecessor of Kalpaka was anxious to overthrow him. Once Kalpaka wanted to invite the royal family on the occasion of his son's wedding feast. He wished to present the insignia to the king, but the discharged minister complained to the king about Kalpaka's treacherous design of usurping the royal throne. The king found the information true and cast Kalpaka and his sons into a deep well. The sons gave the food, hardly sufficient for one man, to their father so that he may live to exact vengeance. The vassals of Nanda, seeing Kalpaka no more, laid seige to the capital and reduced it to great distress. Nanda remembered the services of Kalpaka and called for him. Kalpaka drove away the enemies of Nanda and regained his power. Paraśurāma defeated Kṣatriyas many times and Nanda also defeated them at least twice (Cf. dvitīya iva Bhārgavaḥ. P.T. 25.) Twelve dynasties were established after the Mahābhārata War and they were all uprooted by the Nanda.

Conquest.

Nanda was forced by circumstances to save his own honour and position to undertake the hard task of subduing all his opponents who combined to crush him but were crushed themselves. The Paurava line of Kauśāmbī was tolerated by the Śiśunāgas for Udayana was the brother-in-law of Darśaka. It was uprooted by Mahāpadma and his territory incorporated into Magadha.[1] The inclusion of the Ikṣvāku territory of Kośala (after 25 generations) (by counting the kings)

1. JBORS. I. 89.

seems to be implied by a passage of the Kathāsaritsāgara[1] which refers to the camp of king Nanda in Ayodhyā. Kaliṅga was annexed after 32 generations and the Hathīgumphā inscription of Khāravela[2] (first century B.C.) also refers to king Nanda who carried away as trophies the statue or foot-prints of the first Jina and heirloom of the Kalinga kings to Magadha. K.P. Jayaswal[3] and R. D. Banerji proposed to identify Nandarāja with Nandivardhana of the Śiśunāgas dynasty but the identification is untenable for the Purāṇas distinctly say that when the Śiśunāgas and their predecessors were ruling Magadha, 32 kings reigned in Kalinga in succession synchronously. In view of Nanda's possession of Kalinga, the conquest of Aśmakas (between Godāvarī and Māhiṣmatī on the Narmadā after 25 kings had ruled there) and other regions lying further south does not seem to be altogether improbable. The existence of 'Nau Nanda Dehra'—a city[4] on the Godāvarī also suggests that the dominion of Nanda embraced a considerable portion of the Deccan. Moreover, several Mysore inscriptions[5] state that Kuntala was ruled by the Nandas.

The other dynasties annihilated by him were the Pāñcālas (Rohilkhand, 27 generations); the Kāśīs (24 kings); Haihayas (Khandesh, parts of Aurangabad and south Mālavā, Mahiṣmatī the capital, 28 rulers); Kurus (36 kings); Maithilas (28 sovereigns); Sūrasenas (with Mathura as capital, 23 kings); and the Vītihotras of Avantī who ruled for 20 generations. All these kings are calculated since the days of the Mahābhārata War and only important kings have been counted leaving aside the minor and insignificant kings. And hence we cannot deduce any evi-

1. Tawney's Translation, p. 21.
2. JBORS, III, 4,5.
3. Ibid, I, 90.
4. Macauliffe's Sikh Religion, V, 236; PHAI, p. 189.
5. Rice's Mysore & Coorg from the Inscriptions, p. 3.
6. It was the region bounded by river Narmadā on the north, Tungabhadrā on the south, Arabian Sea on the west, and the Godavari and the Eastern Ghats on the east. De.

dence to calculate their average reign per king. The extent of Mahāpadma's dominion appears to history to have been considerable for the Purāṇas say that he established a 'one king empire' (ekarāṭ), 'under a single umbrella' (ekachatram), and the Divyāvadana calls him 'one of large empire' (mahāmandala).

Regnal Period.

The Purāṇas are of one opinion in ascribing 100 years for the Nanda dynasty. They ascribe 88 years to Mahāpadma and Pargiter[1] remarks that 'the time assigned to Mahāpadma may mean the entire length of his life as the Matsya seems to imply'. According to K. P. Jayaswal[2] the aggregate is made up as:

1.	The sons of Mahānandī	8	years.
2.	Mahānandī	35	,,
3.	Nandivardhana	40	,,
4.	Muṇḍa	8	,,
5.	Aniruddha	9	,,
	Total	100	years.

The Jaina authority also seem to imply that the Nanda dynasty lasted for about a hundred years i.e. 95 years[3]. But Dr. Raychaudhuri thinks that *aṣṭāśīti* is probably a mistake for *aṣṭāviṁśati*. According to Tārānātha he reigned for 29 years. The Ceylonese authorities give 22 years only to the nine Nandas. He ruled for 28 years from B. C. 366 to B. C. 338.

Patron of Letters.

According to the Ārya-Manjuśri Mula-kalpa 'Mahāpadma Nanda was a great patron of intellect and letters. Vararuci was his minister who had a high reputation and Pāṇini was his

1. Purāṇa. T. 24. अष्टाशीति तु वर्षाणि पृथिव्यां वै भविष्यति
2. JBORS, V, 98.
3. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan, VI, 231-2; VIII, 326-39.

favourite. Yet the king became unpopular with the council of ministers, though the king was *satyasandha* in spite of his great power. The king died of illness and old age and nothing untoward happened on account of this alienation of feeling.[1]

Besides leaving a big empire full of treasures Mahāpadma left a large army also. He introduced a new system of weights and measure[2].

Successors.

The Purāṇas assert that he will have 8 sons, of whom Sukalpa, Sahalya, Sumātya, or Sumālya will be the first; and they will be kings in succession to Mahāpadma for 12 years. The Mahābodhīvaṁśa[3] names them as Ugrasena, Mahāpadma Paṇḍuka, Paṇḍugati, Rāṣṭrapāla, Goviṣāṇaka, Daśasiddhaka, Kaivarta and Dhanananda. According to Hemacandra,[4] only 7 descendants of the Nandas succeeded each other. Their ministers were the descendants of Kalpaka, for he had new off-springs. Sakaṭāla, the minister of the ninth Nanda, also was a descendant of Kalpaka.

The youngest brother was called Dhanananda from his being addicted to hoarding treasures. In fact it was Mahānanda who after his conquest of almost the whole India of collected a large treasure from the ruins of so many powerful kings. He is called[5] 'addicted to wealth' and the lord of 990 million gold-coins. He collected riches to the amount of 80 *koṭis* in a rock in the bed of the river Ganges. His enormous wealth 'which having accumulated first in Pāṭalī, hid in the flood of the Ganges' has been referred to by the Tamil writers[6] also. Hiuen Tsang[7] refers to 'the five treasures of king Nanda's

1. KPJ's Imperial History, P. 15.
2. Pāṇini II. 4. 21. Lakṣya.
3. Dictionary of Pali Proper Names.
4. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan VIII, 1-10.
5. Mudrārākṣasa I; III. 27.
6. Beginning of South Indian History, by S. K. Aiyangar, p. 89
7. Watters, II, 96.

seven precious substances'. He levied[1] taxes even on skins, gums, trees, and stones. He gave 108 dinăras daily to Vararuci a poet, philosopher, and grammarian—who attended the king's audience and recited 108 stanzas of his own making.[2]

Nandas, Earlier and Later.

K.P. Jayaswal[3] and H.K. De[4] would translate 'Nava Nandāḥ' as Neo-Nandas and not as 'nine Nandas'. He would include Aniruddha, Muṇḍa, Nanda I (Vardhana), Nanda II (Mahā), Nanda III (Mahādeva), and Nanda IV (the unnamed minor) amongst the kings of the old Nanda dynasty. He points out that these names are actually so spelt in some MSS. but it is not attested by Pargiter. Kṣemendra[5] speaks of Candragupta as 'the son of the earlier Nanda', but in the works of Kṣemendra and Somadeva Pūrvananda is distinguished not from Navananda but from Yogānanda (pseudo-Nanda, the reanimated corpse of king Nanda). The Purāṇas, Jaina and the Ceylonese authorities know the existence of only one Nanda line and they take *nava* to mean nine and not new.

End of Nandas.

According to all accounts— Brahmanical, Buddhistic, and Jaina—the Nanda dynasty was uprooted by Cāṇakya who 'anointed Candragupta as king in the realm'. 'A battle was fought. Bhaddasāla, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, waged war against Candragupta, but he was defeated' and the kingdom passed on to the Mauryas.

1. Turnour, Mahāvamśa, XXXIX.
2. Pariśiṣṭhaparvan, VIII, 11-9.
3. JBORS, I., 87.
4. JBORS, IV, p. 91 et. seq. 'Nandas Earlier and Later' by H. K. Deb.
5. Bṛhatkathā Manjarī, Kathāpīṭha, 24.
Cf. Yogānande yasaḥseṣe purvanandasutastataḍ /
Candragupto vṛto rājye Cāṇakyena mahaujasā. //

According to Bhāmaha[1] (VI century A C.) one night Cānakya entered the dance-hall of Nanda, probably to kill him. Śakaṭāla, according to the Jaina authority, was the minister of the last Nanda king.

Thus Magadha became the supreme power in India under the Nandas and thereafter it passed on to the Mauryas who under Candragupta baffled the attempts of the Greeks and drove them far beyond the natural frontiers of India, and under Aśoka they spread their influence not by force of arms but by that of righteousness.

1. Kāvyālaṁkāra, III, 3.

CHAPTER XIV

KĀRUṢA

Karuṣa was the sixth son[1] of Manu Vaivasvata and as such he was assigned the eastern territory as his kingdom. It would seem that the whole tract, east of Kāśī and south of the Gangā upto the sea[2], was once included in the territory of the Kāruṣas. It was many generations later that a branch of the Ānavas from the west headed by Titikṣu came to the east and established a principality with Aṅga as its capital in circa 2,567 B.C.

The descendants of Karuṣa were the Kāruṣas. They protected northern India from the inroads of the southerns and they were much favourable to the Brahmanic religion[3]. They were determined fighters. During the Mahābhārata period they consisted of several tribes who were looked upon as not closely allied to the races around them.

Their country was very inaccessible and rested on the Vindhyas. It is linked with Cedi, Kāśī and Vatsya. So we may say that it was a hilly country south of Kāśī and Vatsya between Cedi and Magadha. It comprised the hilly region covered partly by modern Baghelkhanda and Bundelkhanda and towards the south-east it bordered the territory still occupied by the Muṇḍas and it extended upto the river Ken on the west.

The Rāmāyaṇa[4] suggests that the Kāruṣas originally inhabited the present Shahabad district and had been driven out at that time to the south and south-west hilly region which is shown to have been their territory during the Mahābhārata times and even later. It was in those days a great forest tract abounding

1. Vā. 86. 2-3; Bd. III. 61. 2-4; Br. VIII. 25. 42. Hv. XI. 658; Mt. XII. 24; Pd. V. 8. 129; Śiva VII. 60. 31; Ag. 272. 17; Mārk. 103. 1. ; Lg. I. 66, 51; Viṣ. IV. 1.14; Gār. 1. 138. 4.
2. Mbh. II. 52, 123.
3. Bhāgavata IX. 2. 16.
4. Rām. 1. 24. 13-25.

in wild birds and beasts. The inhabitants were happy as the country was full of wealth and paddy. The country was considered so holy[1], being sanctified by the birth of Lord Vāmana at Buxar, that even Indra, the lord of Devas, came to this holy land to free himself from the sin of a Brahmin's (Vṛtra's) murder. Rāma on his way to Mithilā stayed in the Siddhāśrama near Buxar which was the home of many Vedic Ṛsis.

Once when Daśaratha was a powerful king, Tāṭakā, wife of Sunda, was the dowager chieftainess of the Kāruṣas. She was hostile to certain monasteries in her territories. Her son Mārīca, a friend of Rāvaṇa, was driven a way from his principality by the rebellious inhabitants of the monastery under a Kauśika Ṛṣi assisted by Rāma. He failed to retrieve his fortunes and went to the extreme south where his friend Rāvaṇa ruled. Tāṭakā was also killed and her descendants were affiliated to the Tārakāyana[2] gotra of Viśvāmitra group.

Days of Mahābhārata

In the days of Vasu, a descendent of Kuru, Kāruṣa was included in the kingdom of Cedi, but soon it became independent in circa 2,203 B.C. Vṛddhaśarman of Kāruṣa married Pṛthukīrti, one of the five brave mothers[3]—the daughters of Vasudeva. His son Dantavakra was a great and mightly king of the Kāruṣas. He was present at the svayamvara of Draupadī.[4]

Jarāsandha, the Emperor of Magadha, vanquished many of his contemporaries (circa 1,890 B. C.) and made Dantavakra wait upon him like a stulent.[5] After the death of Jarāsandha Dantavakra regained his thtone, but shortly thereafter when Sahadeva marched on his way to *digvijaya* (=victory of directions) he made the king of Kāruṣa a tributary[6] one. When

1. Rām. 1. 29,
2. Educational Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India by S. C. Sarkar, 1921, p. 94.
3. Br 14. 19.
4. Mbh. I. 201. 16.
5. Mbh. II. 14. 10.
6. Mbh. II. 27, 3.

the Great Indian War was to break out in 1,867 B. C. the Pāṇḍavas sent messengers to them and the Kāruṣas rallied as the allies of Yudhiṣṭhira under the leadership[1] of Dhṛṣṭaketu. They fought valiantly but were slain at last at the hands of Bhīṣma[2] along with the Cedis and Kāśīs who numbered 14,000 strong.

Buddhist Period

From the general absence of Buddhist remains (except the Piyadasī inscriptions at Chandan Pir, Sasaram,) throughout the district it would appear that when Buddhism was at its height it could obtain no real hold over the present district of Shahabad. Hiuen Tsang visited Mo-ho-so-lo (Masarh—six miles west of Arrah) in VII century A. C. and said that the inhabitants were all Brahmins who did not respect[3] the laws of the Master (i. e. the Buddha).

The headquarters of the modern district of Shahabad was formerly known as Ārāmanagara—a term preserved in a Jain inscription[4] at Masarh. The word Ārāmanagara means a monastery-city and the name of the town, according to Hoey, was Ārāda and Ārāda Kalāma—the teacher of Gautama Buddha, hailed[5] from this city.

Pāṇini[6] describes the Kāruṣas as a powerful tribe along with the Bhargas, Yaudheyas, Kekayas, Kāśmīras and others. Kauṭilya[7], the premier of Candragupta Maurya, considers the elephants of Kāruṣa as of the best type. Bāṇa, in whom King Harṣa found his Boswell, refers[8] to a king Dadhra, lord of the Kāruṣas, who wanted to anoint his eldest son as the heir-apparent, but in so doing he was killed by his other son hidden under the bedding in his apartment.

1. Mbh. V. 62. 4.
2. Mbh. VI. 106. 18.
3. Beal II. 63-65.
4. Archaeological Survey of India, III. 70.
5. J. A. S. B. Vol. 69, p. 77.
6. Gangapāṭha of Aṣṭādhyāyi IV. 1. 178.
7. Arthaśāstra II. 2.
8. Harṣacarita p. 199. (Parab's Ed.).

Cero Kharvars

There are a large number of Kharvars in the districts of of Shahabad and Palamau. Their legendary history states that formerly they were the rulers of Rohtāsgarh and they are of the solar dynasty. They are the congeners of the Muṇḍas and the Ceros. In an inscription[1] of XIII century from Rohtasgarh one Pratāpadhavala calls himself Khayaravāla. Puranic traditions go to show that Kāruṣas were the descendants of Manu and the country was known after them. In course of time they came to be known as Karuvars (descendants of Karuṣa) which was later on transformed into Kharvars.

The Ceras are spoken of in the Aitareyāraṇyaka in a very respectful tone[2]—along with the Vangas and Vagadhas (= Magadhas) who transgressed the Vedic rites of sacrifice. The Ceras are spoken of as the revered Ceras (cf. Cerapāda). This goes to show the high regard paid to the inhabitants of the districts from time immemorial.

The pre-historic finds[3] at Buxar go to prove that the district does not lack in its sources of history but modern historians have paid very little attention to its proper excavation and the the study of its original sources.

1. Epigraphia Indica, IV. 311. n. 11.
2. Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, 1. 1.
3. Remains of a Pre-historic Civilisation in the Gangetic Valley by A. Banerji-Śāstri in K. B. Pathak Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1934. pp. 248-62.

CHAPTER XV

KARKAKHAṆḌA

According to Dr. Buchanan, all the hilly regions between Birbhum and Banaras was called Jhārakhaṇḍa. To the south it extended as far as the river Vaitaraṇī[1].

We do not know for certain the name by which the tract was known to the ancient Aryans. But by the side of the ethnical[2] group Uḍra comes to be classed the ethnic Puṇḍra with its secondary forms Pauṇḍra, Pauṇḍraka, Pauṇḍrika. The approachment is natural as the two peoples Pauṇḍra and Uḍra occur very frequently together in the Mbh[3], Viṣṇu Purāṇa[4], and the Bṛhatsaṁhitā[5]. Puṇḍras are mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[6] also. Paurāṇika tradition[7] represents Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma as the five brothers born of Balin's queen Sudeṣṇā and the sage Dīrghatamas.

According to Pargiter[8] Puṇḍra and Pauṇḍra were two different countries. The former comprised the district of Malda, and parts of Dinajpur and Rajshahi and corresponds to the ancient Puṇḍravardhana between the Ganges and the Brahmaputra. The Pauṇḍras, whose boundaries were Kāśī on the north, Aṅga, Vaṅga and Suhma on the north-east inhabited the territory which forms to-day Chotanagpur less its southern portion. But it seems possible that the Chotanagpur territory was formerly known as Puṇḍra or Pauṇḍra and later when some of them migrated to the east, they styled themselves Pauṇḍras and their country Pauṇḍravardhana (Greater Pauṇḍra) which was perhaps colonised by the Puṇḍras of Chotanagpur.

1. De. p. 81.
2. Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, by Sylvain Levi, Jean Przyluski and Jules Block, translated by P. C. Bagchi, Calcutta., 1929, p. 85.
3. Mbh. III. 61. VI. 9.
4. Viṣṇu IV, 24. 18.
5. Bṛhatsaṁhitā V. 74.
6. Ait. Br. VII. 18.
7. Matsya Ch. 47.
8. Mārkeṇḍeya P. translated p. 329.

Karkakhaṇḍa

The inhabitants of the country have no recollection[1] of any name by which it was known prior to the establishment of the Nāgvaṁśī Rajas, after whom it came to be called Nagpur. To the Muslim historians[2] of India the country was known as Jhārkhaṇḍa and Kokrā.

Jhārkhaṇḍa is very probably an indication that Jhāra (=shrub, bush) grew here in abundance.

Perhaps it was formerly called Karkakhaṇḍa[3] which, owing to its plural use, Sorenson takes it to mean a 'people of the particular name'. It is mentioned along with the kingdoms of Vaṅga, Magadha and Mithilā which were subjugated by Karṇa on his conquest. Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, Secretary, Mahābhārata Editorial Board, Poona, kindly informs me that the whole *Adhyāya* has been omitted in Kāśmīrī, Bengālī and southern MSS. There are only a few comparatively late MSS. which contain this *adhyāya* where the reading of the vulgate is uniformly found, except only one MSS. which reads '*Arka*' for *Karka*. And this is the only reference in the whole of the Mbh. Sukthankar is inclined to think that the name is quite fictitious. The region was so called because the tropic of Cancer (Karkarekhā) or the sun (=Arka) passes through Ranchi, in Chotanagpur.

The country at present is inhabited by the Muṇḍa, Santal, Oraon, Malto, Ho, Kharia, Bhumija, Kora, Asura, and many other branches of the Pre-Dravidian stock.

Home of Muṇḍas

Chotanagpur is a land without a written history.[4] All that concerns the beginning of these tribes is shrouded in doubt

1. Mundas and their Country, by S. C. Roy, 1912, p. 359.
2. Ain-i-Akbarī, translated by Blochmann, Calcutta, 1873, Vol. I. 401, 479. A pargana of Chutiya Nagpur is still called Kokrah. Tuzak-i-Żahāngīrī (pp. 154, 155) defines it as a hilly district between south Bihar and Dakhin. It was annexed to Bihar in 1,025 A. H. (1615 A. C.) by Ibrahim Khan Fath Jang, Governor of Bihar.
3. Mbh. III. 255. 7.
4. Chotanagpur by F. B. Bradley Birt, London, 1903, p. 9.

and uncertainty. Of their real origin and their primitive abode, we are in utter darkness. Of their successive migrations in ancient times through different parts of India, we have no written records to enlighten us, and of various vicissitudes of fortune, they underwent in the dim dark ages of antiquity, our present knowledge is next to nothing.

Whether the Muṇḍas immigrated into India from the now submerged hypothetical continent of Lemuria which has been supposed to have once connected India with Madagaskar and Africa or whether they entered India from the north-east as has some times been supposed, or whether they originated from a mixture of colonists from eastern Tibet or Western China across the Himalays with the Australo-Dravidians to the south of that range or whether they are genuine autochthones of Indian soil, as the Muṇḍas and their congeners in India assert, we have, in the present state of our knowledge, hardly any material to ascertain.

Archaeologists are of opinion that the various stone implements, which are found from Chotanagpur on the west to the Malaya Peninsula on the east, are often so similar in kind that they appear to be the work of one and the same race. Attention has also been drawn to anologous customs found all over the same area and to other coincidences.

But there is hardly any other instance in the history of the world in which a widely diffused race, which was so powerful as to impose its own langage on a number of other peoples, has been utterly effaced from the face of the globe. Moreover, such a whole-sale extinction of man is not at all probable.

Most of these tribes now speaking languages allied to Muṇḍārī are perhaps descended[1] from one and the same original stock and their common forefathers were perhaps the earliest inhabitants of India.

All along the Gangetic valley, in the wilder alluvian fringging the Vindhyas and Kaimurs and far south of these hills, the

1. Roy p. 23.

soil teems with fragmentary remains of ancient stone weapons. Traces of Stone Age have been found in the modern districts of Singhbhum and Manbhum and the south-eastern parts of Ranchi district.

Nāga Civilisation

We may infer that the primitive stock from which the Muṇḍas and other allied tribes in and outside India are supposed to have been descended, had their original abode in the hilly regions extending from the Aravali mountains and proceeding eastwards along the Vindhyan and Kaimur ranges and the south-eastern districts of Chotanagpur, for it is in these parts of India that remains of the most ancient human settlements have been discovered.

It is just possible there was a belt[1] of Nāga civilisation extending in a semi-circle over India and even beyond. At Mohan-jo-Daro a figure seated cross-legged, with worshippers to right and left, a Nāga, and a pictograph have been found on a tablet of blue faience. The Nāgas were serpent-worshippers, and they figure in a semi-mythical way in early epic traditions. In proto-historic times, they are mentioned as people connected with the various mountainous regions called after the names of serpent-kings like Vāsuki, Karakoṭaka, Ananta, Śeṣa, Śaṁkhacūḍa, Puṇḍarika, and Takṣaka. Their daughters were married by epic heroes like Arjuna in the Mbh., and Kuśa, the son of Rāma, marries Kumudvatī,[2] a Nāga-kanyā. They have left memorials in place names e. g. Nagpur, Nagerkoli, Chotanagpur, Nagpattan, Naga Hills. They are mentioned in the Mahāvaṁśa and in early south Indian inscriptions.

Traditional Origin

In the beginning when the earth was covered with water, Singh Bonga (Cf. Bhaga=sun) brooded over the waters, and the

1. Indian Culture through the Ages, by Ṣ. V. Venkatesvara, Mysore University, 1928.
2. Raghuvaṁśa XVII. 6.

fir t beings that were born[1] were a Kachua or tortoise, Karakom or crab, and a Lendad or leech. He commanded them to bring him a lump of clay from the depths of the primeval ocean. The tortoise and the crab tried in vain but the leech succeeded in taking out a bit of clay. With this clay Singh Bonga made this beautiful earth and at His biddings the earth brought forth herbs, creepers, plants and trees of many-fold varieties. He next filled the earth with birds and beasts of all sorts and sizes. The bird Har (which according to the Muṇḍa belief lays only one egg in its life) or swan laid an egg. And out of this egg came forth a boy and a girl—the first human beings. These were the progenitors of the Horo-Honko, the sons of man as the Muṇḍas still style themselves.

The first pair were innocent of sex-relation. So king Bonga pointed out to them certain vegetable roots and taught them to prepare ili (cf. idā=water) or beer. The first pair Tota Harom (Tāta Hara-Lord Śiva) and Tota Buri, the naked ancestors, were inflamed with passion after drinking the beer. They were blessed with offsprings. Muṇḍa, Nanka, and Rora or Tenha were the three sons. All this happened at a place called Ajab-garh, which may correspond to Ajabgarha, Ajayagarh, Azamgarh, or Adamgarh.

From there the descendants went successively to various places. Kharvar is, according to Santhali tradition, the name given to the old tribe from which Santhals, Hos, Muṇḍas, Bhumij and others are dercended. And the Kharvars claim to be Sūryavaṁśī Kṣatriyas.

Risley thinks that the Asuras are the remanants of a race of earlier settlers who were driven out by the Muṇḍas. Perhaps it iṣ an attempt on the part of the Muṇḍas to invent a legend like the Aryans to crush the Asuras,[2] who may be wicked beings. S.C. Roy infers that the present day Asuras constitute a tribe of the same stock as the Muṇḍas.

1. Roy, Appenpix I.
2. JBORS. 1926 pp. 147-52. The Asura, Ancient and Modern.

Kolas

The word Kola is applied by the Hindus to the Hos, Muṇḍāris and Oraons, and sometimes also to other tribes of the Muṇḍa stock. Kola occurs[1] in the Durgāsaptaśatī as the name of a warrior caste. In Sanskrit it means a Bhila, Mleccha, a pig etc. Some hold that the word Kola has been used by the Aryans as a term of abuse in order to denote the aboriginal tribes.

According to Pāṇini[2] the word Kola is derived from the root Kula which is used in the sense[3] of Samstyana (collection or extent) and Bandhu (brothers). So it hardly follows that the word Kola which was primarily used in the sense of a pig was transferred to the aborigines to denote despise. As a matter of fact a word is used in various meanings and if it is applied in a good sense it does not follow that it has been transferred from a bad meaning.

According to others, 'Kol' is the same word as the Santali *har* a man. As the religious head of the village community, he was known as the Pāhan (Pradhāna) and he was required to offer public sacrifices. As the head in the secular matters, he presided over the Pancāyats for the settlement of disputes, inflicted punishment for offence against established custom, and represented the community in its dealings with outsiders. Gradually the secular and religious functions became distinct, and the next most important man in the village became responsible for secular affairs and was known as the Muṇḍa, a term which eventually gave its name to the tribe and, perhaps, the individual also called himself a Muṇḍa as everybody in the kingdom of Vaiśālī called himself a Rājā.

The word Muṇḍa in Sanskrit means 'one whose head is completely shaved'. The word Muṇḍa in the Mbh.[4] is also used to apply to a populace of the north-western frontier of India designated by the nickname of 'shaved heads'. The

1. Durgāsaptaśatī III. 2. (Kolās, the destroyer).
2. Dhātupāṭha No. 867.
3. Amara II. 6. 48.
4. Mbh. III. 51; VII. 119.

Hindus who were bound by their religion to wear a tuft (Cūḍa) on the top of their head, despised the foreign population who shaved their whole head. Shaved like a Greek or a Kamboja were expressions in vogue even in the days of Pāṇini.[1]

Pre-historic Archaeology

The hilly plateau of Chotanagpur with its gneissose rocks is one of the oldest formations. The traces of its pre-historic[2] Stone Age and Copper Age may be seen all over the region.

Archaeological discoveries, though as yet scanty in Chotanagpur; go to show that Chotanagpur has been the home of man since ages. Chotanagpur had, as elsewhere, travelled much farther along the path of material civilisation than it has been hitherto supposed.

In Chotanagpur only a few artefacts of old Stone Age have been unearthed so far. As for the actual life led by the neolithic man in the plateau very little evidence has been unearthed. But it would be a mistake to conclude from the scanty remains discovered that the cultural status of the Stone Age people in the region was inconceivabely low. These artefacts discovered do give some indication of the neolithic man's culture in Chotanagpur. But these are merely the imperishable residuary of the most ancient culture. Its other handworks of less durable materials have disappeared in the course of ages elapsed.

As we proceed from the Stone Age[24] to the Chalcolithic and Copper Age culture we find abundant evidence that man was slowly but surely progressing through the ages. Advancement in knowledge, skill and artistic taste is evident by the increasing abundance in variety and complexity of types and forms of lithic and metal artefacts made by hands.

In Chotanagpur the evidence of Chalcolithic stage of culture is found all round. There are a large number of Chal-

1. Gaṇapāṭha of Pāṇini II. i. 72.

2. Ranchi Zila School Centenary Volume pp. 42-50. A Bird's Eye View of the Archaeology of Chotanagpur, by S. C. Roy.

3. JBORS. 1916. 61-77. Notes on Pre-historic Stone Implements in Ranchi.

colithic sites and a decent collection of copper artefacts of shapes and sizes for various uses exhibited in the Patna Museum. The settlements of Chalcolithic man in Chotanagpur are popularly called Asuragarhs and are situated on elevated grounds by the river sides and command a wide view of the area around. Thus they were eminently suited for effective defence against hostile attacks. Some large tanks silted up are known as Asura pokharas and are locally attributed to them.

Asura remains include ancient brick structures, large dolmens or flat stone slabs planted upright in the ground, phallic symbols of stone or terracottas, copper ornaments, quartz beads, bronze and copper vessels and plates and other artefacts made for use or ornaments for show and amusement or for magical and ceremonial uses, rude hand-made potteries as well as wheel-made potteries ornamented with geometric and other designs which are symbolic, terracotta figures of different shapes and sizes, small ornamented spouts and terracotta dishes concave on both sides and incised with either floral or geometrical design or with figures of birds and beasts. Fragments of enamelled pottery have also been found from these Asura building sites. Copper artefacts particularly axe-heads and picks and plough-shares have been found in the area.

The remains of Asuragarhs represent the residences of Asura chiefs of Chalcolithic Age. Their brick foundations cover wide spaces but the rooms are rather small sized, generally 10 to 12 ft. in length and 6 to 8 ft. in breadth. The superstructure was probably of wood or clay. Its bricks generally measure 17″, 10″, and 3″. Besides the neoliths and copper artefacts a few iron articles have also been found.

The Muṇḍa tradition attributes the introduction of iron to the Asuras. The various copper and terracotta vessels and other objects unearthed from the Asura sites bear testimony to a fairly high state of pre-historic civilisation. Their elaborate burials and the practice of providing their dead with food, drink and light in earthenware lamps to serve them in their dark underground abode or perhaps to illuminate their

journey to the other world would point to their belief in life after death.

The pre-historic Asuras appear to represent an undeveloped and stray offshoot of the culture that, with unique opportunities for development in the Indus Valley, developed into the Chalcolithic culture of Mohen-jo-Daro and Harappa. Comparing great things with small we may say, "the two cultures have a family likeness, although the difference between them is as great as between an illiterate urchin brought up in rude surroundings and a highly cultured big brother accomplished in various arts and sciences in more than one celebrated foreign university where intimate contact with diverse peoples of diverse cultures has further improved his culture to an extraordinary degree."

Yogimārā Inscription

The inscription was first brought to the notice of scholars by Bloch. Its wall paintings in the caves are regarded as the *oldest* specimens yet found in India. It reads[1]:

Sutanuka (nama) Devadasiy

Sutanuka nama•Devadasiti tam kamayitha Balunaseye Devadinanama lupadakhe.

About the female servant of a monastery Sutanukā by name.

Sutanukā by name is a female servant in the monastery. Varuṇaseva (a worshipper of Varuṇa) caused her to fall in love. Devadīna (trying Judge) by name, officer-in-charge of the offences against the Vinaya.

Perhaps Sutanukā seems to have been temporarily confined to a peculiar cell with a record of her offences inscribed on it as a warning and as an example to others.

Dasyus

Some are of opinion that the Dāsas and Dasyus of Ṛgveda are the aborigines of India. They are the haters of Brāhmaṇas (Brahmadviṣa), fierce-eyed (ghoracakṣas), eater of raw flesh[2]

1. JBORS. 1923, pp. 273-293.
2. Ṛgveda VII. 104. 2.

(kravyāda), riteless (avrtin), black-skinned[1] (tvacam kṛṣṇam), deformed nose[2] (śiśipram), and of imperfect speech[3] (mṛdhravāca).

According to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[4] Dasyus are said to have been descended from the cursed younger sons of Viśvāmitra. According to the Puranic tradition[5] king Vena's body was churned and there sprang a man short in stature, black as the crow, high cheek-bones, small legs, flat nose, red eyes and tawny hair. Yayāti[6], the son of Nahuṣa, made a division of his empire among his five sons and in the tenth generation from Turvasu the four brothers Pāṇḍya, Kerala, Kola and Cola divided India among themselves.

Reconstruction

The various contradictory statements of the Purāṇas cannot be taken into consideration to trace their history from the beginning. In the absence of any record tribal legends are of utmost importance.

The Ekasibaḍḍi and Tirasipiḍḍi of the Muṇḍas in Shahabad district from where they trace their descent, their original name Kharvar from which the tribes are descended, driving of Balin to the Pātāla or the lower region in the dwarf incarnation from the Kāruṣa country as referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa, the verbal resemblance of Kharvars with the Kāruṣas who were one of the descendants of Manu Vaivasvata, and who were placed in the eastern territory where they ruled even in the days of Rāma and the claim of the present Kharvars to be Sūryavaṁśī Kṣatriyas—all these go to prove that the Muṇḍas shifted to the hilly region from the Shahabad district, and once they were spread all along the Vindhya range beginning from the Arāvali hills. In the absence of any veiled reference or allusion to their foreign origin it cannot be said that they came

1. Rv. I. 130. 8.
2. Rv. V. 45. 6.
3. Rv. V. 32. 8.
4. Ait. Br. VII. 18.
5. Bhāgavata Purāṇa IV. 14.
6. Harivaṁśa Ch. 30-32.

to the land they inhabit at present from any other country than India itself from where they spread elsewhere.

The tradition recorded by S C. Roy of their residence in Azamgarh will hold good only if it refers to their remote residence when they had not separated from their parent stock and lived near Ayodhyā near Azamgarh.

We are not in a position to detail a connected history of the period. However, the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa refers to a king Suratha[1] of the Caitra dynasty in the days of Manu Svārociṣa II who was defeated by the Kolas. Suratha defeated them with the help of a goddess.

The last traditional king of the Sabaras belonged to the Tretā. The Bhṛgus, Raghus, and the Nāgas combined to rob the Sabaras of their kingdom which then passed on to the Bhṛgus who introduced the patriarchal age which superseded the matriarchal rule of village mothers.

Sañjaya describes the array of battle adopted by Bhīṣma in the Mbh[2]. He says that on the left wing are the Muṇḍas with the Kāruṣas, Vikuñjas and Kuṇḍivarṣa. Sātyaki compares the Muṇḍas with Dānavas and boasts[3] 'I shall kill the Muṇḍas as Indra killed the Dānavas.' The Mbh. classes Muṇḍika or Muṇḍa among the people conquered by Karṇa[4] in the east. It was natural for the Muṇḍas to side[5] with the Kauravas for the Pāṇḍavas had killed Jarāsandha, their ally. A Muṇḍārī song refers to the Great Indian War as follows[6] :—

There brothers and cousins at their own kinsmen shot
Nephews and cousins to piece one another hack
Thick fly their arrows like icha flowers bright.

Ally of Magadha

Betwixt the realms of Aṅga and Magadha was a river Campā where serpents dwelt and here a serpent king Cāmpeya

1. Durgāsaptaśatī Ch. 1.
2. Mbh. Bhismaparvan 56. 9.
3. Mbh. VII. 119. 33.
4. Mbh. III. 255. 7.
5. Mbh. III. 255. 8.
6. Roy. pp. 86-87.

held sway[1]. The kings of Aṅga, and Magadha were at war. One day king Magadha, having fought a battle with Aṅga and facing defeat, mounted his charger and took to flight, pursued by Aṅgas[1] warriors. The king plunged into the flooded river and with the help of the serpent king (Nāgarāja), he got possession of the Aṅga king and slew him and ruled over the two realms together. From that time there was a firm alliance between him and the serpent king who received tributes from the king of Magadha. Probably the Magadhan king was Bimbisāra.

1. Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka (No. 545) Vol VI. 271.

CHAPTER XVI

GEOGRAPHY

The modern province of Bihar has no natural or scientific boundaries except on the north where Nepal has extended at the cost of Bihar. To the east and west certain areas now included in Bengal and Uttar Pradesh were formerly included in Bihar. The eastern, southern and western boundaries have been changing from age to age.

At present, as in the past, Bihar has been by no means an uniform area. Politically, in ancient times, it had a number of distinct units within it; and geographically it is made up of at least three distinct parts: 'the low lying moist plains of north Bihar, the comparatively dry lands of south Bihar of different soil and the plateaus and the hilly country still further south. These areas also differ in their physical features, the character of their peoples and their lauguages.[1] At present the province of Bihar extends from the borders of Nepal to Orissa in the south. It is bounded on the east by Bengal, and on the west by Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. Any history of "Bihar", therefore, must always be a compilation of several histories.

Name

Bihar is so called after the town of Bihar in Patna district. Oṭantapurī[2] the site of modern Bihar Sharif[3] was, in the time

1. O'Malley's Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, Sikkim, Cambridge University Press, 1917.

2. We get the forms Oṭanta, Oḍanta, and Uḍḍayanta in Tibeten which gives Otanta in Chinese. It means 'the city of soaring towers'. Another form met with is Uddaṇḍapurī—the city of the raised sceptre i.e. the royal capital. I am indebted to Dr. S. C. Sarkar for the Tibeten sources.

3. The word seems to occur first in the following couplet :
Bakht-sū-yidar-at khazān āyad
Rāst chūn but parast sū-yi Bahār. (Browne II. 54.)
(*Fortune comes creeping to thy door !*
Just as does the idolator to Bahār.)
Written by the brother of Qwami of Ganj born in 1,180 A.C.
Browne's Literary History of Persia. II 47.

of the Pāla kings, one of the most important centres of Magadha, and the Muslim writers called the town of Oṭantapurī by the name of Bihar on accouns of the large number of Vīhāras or Buddhist monasteries there. When this town, after its fall, became the centre of Muslim adventurers in the east, any districts round about that were brought under Muslim control were included in the newly founded chieftainship of the province of Bihar. The name Bihar as a province is first to be met with in the Tabākat-i-Nāsiri[1] and is, therefore, a comparatively late mediaeval name. The roughly corresponding old name was Magadha, which, though geographically a small unit had a large domain under its political suzerainty. But in no period of history the original local names of Aṅga, and Magadha etc. seem to have been lost. What Magadha originally and properly meant will be seen later on.

The word *Vihāra* means a Buddhist monastery (ārāma). And since the province is the birth-place of Buddhism, a large number of monasteries were scattered throughout its length and breadth. In subsequent Mohammadan times, Muslim writers, 'by a playful conciet which was, however, based on a real admiration for its climate and fertility, declared that the name meant 'the land of eternal spring' (from the Persian *Bahār*).

The Mahābhārata[2] names the five peaks of Girivraja enshrining the five caityas as Vaihāra, Vipula, Vārāha, Vṛṣabha, and Ṛṣigiri. The world *Vehāra* also has been used in the Matsya Sūkta[3] as the name of a country where the icon of the goodess Bhadrakālī should be made of 18 hands.[4]

1. A General History of the Muhammadan Dynasties of Asia, including Hindustan from A. H. 194 to A. H. 658 (810-1260 A. C.) by Maulana Minhaj-i-Siraj, translated by Raverty, London, 1881, p. 520. For converting Hijra dates into Christian era the following formula may be applied : (H—3H/100+622)=A.C. (H stands for Hijra year).

2. Mbh. II. 21. 2.

3. Paṭala 50, as quoted by Śabdakalpadruma.

4. Elements of Hindu Iconography by T. A. Gopinath Rao, Madras, 1914, Vol. I. 357.

North Bihar

North Bihar lies to the north of the Ganges. It is watered by a number of rivers, flowing south-eastwards from the Himalayas, which have gradually raised their beds by the deposition of silt and flow on ridges slighty above the general level of the surrounding country. Most of them overflow their banks after heavy rain-fall in the mountains of Nepal, and in past ages they have frequently changed their courses. There are numerous marshes and meres. Some represent the deeper portions of abandoned river beds. In the rains they are filled up by the overflow of the rivers, but for the remainder of the year they dry up either entirely or in part, and admit of cultivation or form grasslands.

It is evidently a riparian country full of marshy lake regions. This nature of the country is traceable in the earliest literature since the Vedic period onwards. Thus we hear about the ever-flowing Sadānīrā[1], the mighty confluence of the Gaṇḍaka and the Ganges[2] or of the marshy lakes of the Kauśikī[3]. In the Indian historical tradition, Vaiśālī figures as a port[4] and a trading centre from which colonists sailed down the Gaṅgā and the Bay of Bengal to distant Ceylon[5] to colonise it and to rule over it. It was the maritime strength of Vaiśālī which led the Magadhans to construct a dockyard of their own at Pāṭaliputra in imitation.

South Bihar

The greater part of it is an alluvial plain sloping gently northwards to the Gaṅgā. South Bihar imperceptibly passes on into Chotanagpur and there is no natural boundary. We shall see later on that ancient Magadha included a good deal of Chotanagpur.

1. *Śatapatha* Br. 1.4.1.14.
2. *Vārāha* P. Ch. 144.
3. *Vārāha p.* 140.
4. Rām 1. 45. 6.
5. Cf. The V aḍḍas of Ceylon. The stem form and the plural also is Vadi. This seems to point to a Pali *Vajji* (excluded) probably of Ceylon. Buddhistic Studies, Ed. by B. C. Law p. 718.

'The climate is drier than that of north Bihar. The rivers, with the exception of the Śoṇa, have smaller catchment areas than those north of the Gaṇgā, and are not of any great size'. The Śoṇa has continually been changing its bed from period to period. At one time the present bed of the Punaḥpunā to the south-east of Patna must have been the Śoṇa river. The Rāmāyaṇa[1] calls it Māgadhī. It is described as 'looking beautiful as a garland, within the five principal hills'. According to De[2] 'the Śoṇa formerly flowed through Rajgir and through the present bed of the Sarasvatī, and later on through the bed of the Phalgu river[3]. The Amarakoṣa calls it Hiraṇyabāhu. Many of the south Bihar rivers are *antaḥsalilā* (flowing below the surface). The other important rivers are Ṛṣikulyā (Kiyul)[4], Niranjanā, Pancānana, or Sappini, Phalgu and Punaḥpunā. According to Mahābhārata[5] the country of Magadha was full of cows and Mahua forests (a feature of Chotanagpur area). It was pleasant with herds of cattle, perennial water supply from streams and dams (this also is truer of the Chotanagpur area than the plains bordering the Ganges), and beautiful houses and it was devoid of diseases.'

Chotanagpur

The greater part of Chotanagpur is an upland region with a general elevation of 2,000 to 2,500 ft. with ridges rising to about 4,500 ft. The rainfall is fairly heavy, but owing to the broken and undulating surface, it runs off rapidly; and to admit of rice cultivation, the slopes have to be carved into terraces, which spread down them in a fan-like formation looking 'like the patch-work robes of monks' from hill tops. Chotanagpur possesses great mineral wealth, especially in coal, iron, copper and mica. The great importance[6] given by Kau-

1. Rām, 1. 32. 9.
2. Geographical Dictionary, p. 96.
3. Agni Purāṇa Ch. 219.
4. Mahāvagga Tīkā Ch. II.
5. Mbh. II. 21. 31-32.
6. Kautilya's Arthaśāstra, Book II, Ch. III. ; Minerology and Mining in Ancient India, by S. K. Roy, J.B.R.S. XXVIII, 266-84.

ṭilya to the government department of mining industries probably points to a very early utilisation of the Magadhan resources.

The scenery is diversified and often beautiful. 'Open country and rolling downs alternate with richly wooded hills enclosing peaceful and secluded valleys. Streams of clear spring-fed water may be seen rippling down over rock-strewn beds, and wooded glens'. In fact, much of the area of the so-called Chotanagpur is a part and parcel of Magadha, for if we exculde it Magadha becomes almost a line, a length without breadth.

The holy places and capital cities of Magadha are generally situated in the hilly regions of the N. E. Vindhyan plateau, Cf. Vaidyanāthadhāma, Pārśvanātha, Gayā, Rājagṛha and Rājāpurī (Rajaulī). Moreover, Magadha is always described as a hilly country from the top of which green rising fields with crop-destroying deer coming down the hill-slopes may be seen all round. 'Pleasantly picturesque is this part of land. Delightful is the sight of the grassy woodland. The river Niranjanā is flowing on in a grassy stream, showing the bathing places with gradual descent of steps presenting a charming landscape, and affording glimpses into the neighbouring hamlets easy of access. This must needs be the fitting place for a scion of the noble race strenously striving after the highest attainments[1]. Bāṇa[2] describes the Śoṇa valley in similar terms : Pleasant is the neighbourhood of this great river, which makes dull the lusture of Mandākinī. Here are honeyed voices of peacocks, trees having stocks besanded with heaps of pollen, the entrancing hum of lute-like clusters of scent-intoxicated bees. Some two leagues across the Śoṇa is the abode of the saint Cyavana, a forest entitled Cyāvana.

Name

The name is a corruption of Chotiya Nagpur—a straggling village[3] on the eastern outskirts of Ranchi and within the

1. Lalitavistara, Ch. XVII. p. 248.
2. Harṣacarita (Cowell's edition, pp. 15 and 21).
3. Ranchi District Gazetteer, p. 244.

municipal limits. It is one of the earliest residences of the Nāgavaṁśī Rajas of Chotanagpur. It gives its name to the country, which though now spelt Chotanagpur is found in old records as Chuttah or Chutea Nagpur.

According to the late S. C. Roy,[1] the name Chotanagpur is one of comparatively recent origin and appears to have been first coined by the early British administrators of the country to distinguish it from the other Nagpur possessed by the Marathas.

K. P. Jayaswal[2], who was responsible for throwing new light on many dark periods of Indian history, holds that there was a dyansty of the Chuṭu kings who were a branch of the imperial Āndhra dynasty. Chuṭu is the same word as Sanskrit Chuṇṭ to become 'stunted or small.' It survives in the word Chutia Nagpur.

Mountains and Hills

To the south of the Ganges, the Kairamālī (Kaimur hills), an off-shoot of the Vindhyan range covers 800 sq. miles in the south of Shahabad. The fort of Rohtas (Maulī) is situated at a height of about 1,000 ft. Other principal ranges are the Skhalatikā[3] (Barabar Hills), Gorathagiri (Bathani kā Pahad), Gurupādagiri (Gurpa hills), Indraśilā (Giriyaka hills), Antargiri (Khargapur hills), Kolācala and Makula Parvata. The highest peak in Chotanagpur is Pārśvanātha—so called after the name of the twenty-third Jaina Tīrthaṁkara who attained Nirvāṇa here.

Ethnology

There are four main stocks, Viz. Pre-Dravidian, Dravidian, Mongoloid, and Aryan. The most primitive races are the Pre-Dravidians, and Dravidians, who survive, like islands in a sea of alien races especially in the hilly country of Chotanagpur

1. JBORS. XVIII. 52 ; XXVI. 189-223.
2. History of India, (A.C. 150 to 350), Lahore, 1933, pp. 165-7.
3. Fleet's Coupus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol. III. p. 32.

and Santhal Parganas. Mongoloids are found in the Tarai to the extreme north. The Aryan element has spread everywhere and modified the other types.

The physical features of the Mongoloids are well known. The head is broad, complexion dark (probably due to some Khaśa mixture) with a yellowish tinge, hair on the face scanty, stature short or below the average, nose fine to broad, face characteristically flat, eye-lids often oblique.

The pre-Dravidian type pervades the Chotanagpur plateau. Its salient characteristics are a dark almost blackish skin, long heads, dark beady eyes, plentiful jet-black hair, with a tendency to curl, thick and broad nose sometimes depressing at the root which is of negro-like proportions, projecting jaws and teeth, thick lips, and low narrow foreheads. In built they are stout and muscular and in stature somewhat below the medium.

The Maithilas of the N. E. part of the north Bihar have a very ancient history. The land has been for centuries under the domination of the Brāhmaṇas extremely devoted to learning. And this Brahmanical domination has left ineffaceable marks upon the nature of the rest of the population. The land has passed through conquest from the north and south, east and west, without changing its ancestral peculiarities. They refuse to admit other nationalities to intercourse on equal terms.

Parallel to the Maithila tradition, there is in north Bihar another tradition of land-holding and trade continued from epic Vaiśālī through Buddhistic Vajjis and Licchavīs represented by the Gahapatis and the Vaidehakas of earlier times and the Bhumiharas of subsequent times.

Languages

There are four linguistic families, Viz. Indo-European, Austro-Asiatian, Dravidian, and Tibeto-Chinese. The principal Indo-European languages are Bihari, Hindi, Bengali, and Urdu. The Austro-Asiatian family is supposed to be represented by the Muṇḍa languages and the Dravidian by the Oraon and Malto.

The Indo-Aryan, Muṇḍa, and Dravidian languages are

respectively spoken by 91, 7 and 1 per cent of the population. The great majority of people speak Bihari whose three dialects are known as Maithili, Māgadhī, and Bhojapurī.

The Muṇḍa languages are agglutinative and preserve this characteristic abundantly. Suffix is piled upon suffix and helped out by infix, till we obtain words which have the meaning of a sentence. The vocabulary is rich in terms for natural objects and the common incidents of village and jungle life, but it is practically destitute of complex sentiments and abstract ideas.

The distinct aloofness of the Muṇḍa and Aryan languages of the neighbourhood can be understood only if we take into consideration the case of England and Wales. A modern writer says[1], English language though backed by sword has never been able to conquer Wales, a surprising fact when we consider how often the two countries are separated by a legal boundary, a few miles on either side of which the speech of one or the other may fail to be understood."

Some scholars[2] think it possible to derive the Muṇḍa and Dravidian forms of speech from the same origin, and others hold that they have nothing to do with each other. The late S.C. Roy[3] held that a large number of Muṇḍārī words of primary importance denoting things and actions, which even the most primitive people cannot do without, look like either pure Sanskrit words or clear variations of such words. Even the grammatical forms of the Muṇḍa language would seem to be akin to those of some ancient dialect of Sanskrit. In India, the use of the dual forms of nouns, pronouns, and verbs does not appear to occur except only in Sanskrit and Muṇḍārī.

As regards the Dravidan languages T. S. Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī says[4] : It is a great mistake to suppose that the Dravidians and

1. The New World of Today, Vol. I. 42. quoted by G. P. Ambastha, in Sahitya, III (2) p. 31.

2. G.A. Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India, Muṇḍa and Dravidian Languages, Vol. IV. 2. (Calcutta, 1906).

3. JBORS. 1923, pp. 376-393 : A Possible Ethnic Basis for the Sankritic Element in the Muṇḍa Languages by S. C. Roy.

4. The Age of Saṁkara, by T. S. Nārāyaṇa Śāstri, Thompson and Co., Madars, 1916, p. 82.

their languages—Tamil, Telegu, Malayalam, Kanarese, and Tulu—form by themselves a separate race and a distinct family of languages, non-Aryan or entirely different from the Aryans and absolutely unconnected with the family of the Aryan or Indo-European Languages.' He tries to prove that they are closely related. I am inclined to agree with Roy and Śāstrī to some extent.

Religions

The great majority of the people are Hindus. Acceptance of caste, authority of the Brāhmaṇa, sanctity of the cow and ancestor worship, make an orthodox Hindu at the present day. Every Hindu also believes in transmigration and recognises some god or other of the crowded pantheon in his domestic ceremonies.

The cult[1] of Sing Bonga and ancestor worship are eharacteristics of the Muṇḍa religion. Subordinate deities and spirits also have to be worshipped. Sing-Bonga is the sun-spirit or god of light. He is the invisible supreme being who created all other Bongas and is essentially and wholly good. All men's lives are in his hands, though power to do mischief is given to the inferior deities. There is no specific worship of Sing-Bonga, but he has to be saluted every morning. In times of calamity, he receives a sacrifice of a white goat or a fowl.

Buddhism and Jainism have almost entirely disappeared from the land of their birth. Their survivals can be traced in some local customs of the people especially of the lower class. Their temples are still to be found in ruins in their respective holy places, now-a-days gradually being restored and added to by all India Buddhist or Jaina revivalist organisations.

A fair number of Muslims all over the state and some Christians are to be found converted from the various upper and lower Hindu castes and the aborigines.

1. Raṇchi District Gazetteer, p. 91.

CHAPTER XVII

SOURCES

No inscriptions except the brief ones on the three Śiśunāga statues (and the recently discovered Rajauli inscriptions which cannot be read) nor any coins bearing the names of any king (except certain punch-marked coins) have been discovered which can be referred with any amount of certainty to the pre-Mauryan period. Our evidences are, therefore, mainly literary and that too Indian and they are not supplemented by any foreign notice except for the period just before the Mauryas. The Indian literature useful for the purpose of the historian of the pre-Mauryan period may be divided into five classes : (a) Vedic Literature (b) Epics and Purāṇas and other late or classical references, (c) Buddhist literature, (d) Jaina literature, and (e) Tribal legends.

Vedic Literature

According to Pargiter[1] the Vedic literature 'lacks the historical sense and is not always to be trusted' ! "But the evidences derived from the Vedic literature are very strong and carry authority. Many of them are either directly comtemporary records or are traditions derived from contemporary evidence". We, however, admit that too much reliance on them as is placed by some religiously disposed Indians is dangerous. A detailed information from a particular source is an indication of the source being well-informed, for a detailed information is possible only from a well-informed true tradition and hence may be used as a historical basis excepting what is a manufactured tale or mythology derived from blind popular belief.[2] To this class of literature belong the Saṁhi-

1. Pargiter's Ancient Indian Historical Traditions, preface.

2. Chronology of Ancient India, by Dr. S. N. Pradhan, Calcutta, 1927, preface, XI-XII.

tās, Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, and the Upaniṣads. These works are in the main pre-Buddhistic.

Epics and Purāṇas

No definite date can be assigned to these works. 'Critical inquiry will not allow the actual authorship of Vālmīki or Vyāsa and the handling of poems unchanged from the beginning. No aid can be hoped for from the Greeks to discover the age of these works, as nothing can be concluded against their antiquity from our finding no mention of them in the works of those writers as the Greeks did not acquire any intimate knowledge of India. They applied themselves chiefly to describe the religions, situations, climate, and the custom of the inhabitants.'[1]

Antiquity Of Rāmāyaṇa

'The burning of widows on the funeral pyres of their husbands, which the Greeks describe as an old custom when Alexander invaded India in B. C. 326, is utterly unknown to the Rāmāyaṇa, and one fact like this speaks volumes. An epic poem is the faithful image of the creeds, cults, and customs of the age in which it arose. Non-mention of any aspect of these in the epic is a very probable indication that it did not exit when the poem was composed. There is no mention of the mystic devotion or *bhakti* which sprang up later as it is mentioned in the Mahābhārata. The island of Ceylon is not called Taprobane or Pale Simunder[2] or Saline, names[3] anterior by some centuries to the Christian era. Nor is it even called Siṁhala—a name connected with the occupation of the island by Vijayasiṁha in B. C. 543. The name which the

1. The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki translated by R. T. H. Griffith, London, Trubner & Co 1870, Vol. I. Introduction.

2. McCrindle p. 62. Palesimunder is probably a Greek form of Pali Simānta. The name had gone out of use before the time of Ptloemey.

3. The island ehanged its name with notable frequency. The Greeks at first called it Antichthonos (Pliny VI. 22). At the time of Alexander it was called Pali Simoundon. It was later known as Serendivus, Sirlediba, Serendib, Zailan and Sailan (Ceylon). JBORS. XXVIII. 222.

island bears in the Rāmāyaṇa is always the primitive, most ancient Laṁkā.'

The name Yavana may have been anciently used by the Indians to denote the nations situated to the west of India and it was after Alexander that it was applied principally to the Greeks. Th mention of Tathāgata[1] may lead one to assign it a late date, but the stanza is not found in the Bengali and the north-western recensions and so it cannot affect its early composition. According to the Rājataraṅginī[2] Dāmodara II was cursed by certain Brāhmaṇas and the malediction was to cease on the day he would hear the Rāmāyaṇa recited. Dāmodara reigned from B. C. 1,433 to 1,418, if my chronology[3] may be accepted.

The Jātaka of an unnamed king was translated[4] into Chinese from an original Indian text by Kang-Seng-Hui in A.C. 251; and the Nidāna of king Ten-Luxuries (Daśarata) was similarly translated by Lekaya in A.C. 472. The former relates how the king was helped by a monkey-chief in searching out his wife and the other gives the story of the Rāmāyaṇa in short but it gives the period of exile 12 years instead of 14 years. In any case the internal evidence, e.g., archaism and varied readings offered by the poem is the greatest proof of its remote antiquity. So taking all these points into consideration we may say that the kernel of the Rāmāyaṇa cannot be placed later than 251 A. C.

Age of Mahābhārata

As regards the present Mahābhārata, Hopkins says[5], "Buddhist supremacy already decadent is implied by passages which allude contemptuously to the *eḍukas* or Buddhist monuments as having ousted the temples of the gods. It has undergone

1. Rām. II. 109. 34.
2. Rāj. I. 54.
3. Journal of Indian History, Vol. XVIII. 55.
4. Rāmāyaṇa in Chinese, edited by Dr. Raghuvira & C. Yamamoto, Lahore, 1938.
5. The Great Epics of India, p. 391.

various redactions. It was formerly known as Jaya and consisted of the account of victory, i.e., the victory of Pāṇḍavas.[1] Vaiśampāyana recited the story of the struggle between the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus to Janamejaya at Taxila[2] and the final redaction took place in the Naimiṣāraṇya before a large gathering by Sūta Lomaharṣaṇa. It perhaps acquired the dimension of a *śatasāhasrī* (1,00,000) as it was known later during the Gupta age. It is Mahābhārata because herein are described the illustrious lives of the Bhāratas.[3] The major portion of the extant Mahābhārata., may be assigned to a period previous to the political establishment of Buddhism. In any case, the present Mahābhārata, if we exclude the question of the minor interpolations here and there and in different recensions, cannot be later than the fourth century A. C.

Purāṇas

'Modern writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the Purāṇic lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition'.[4] 'The Purāṇas profess to give us the ancient history of India. In so doing they begin from the earliest Ṛgvedic period describing genealogies of kings who established kingdoms and principalities and thus parcelled out and ruled ancient India. Occasionally the feats and achievements of kings and Ṛṣis are related, battles mentioned and described, noticeable incidents and happenings recorded and very valuable synchronisms noted down.'[5] 'In the dynastic lists the Purāṇas themselves do not say that each successor in the list was a son or a relative of his predecessor. In many cases they only say that so and so came after so and so, without indicating any relationship between them. It is

1. Mbh. 1. 62. 22.
2. Mbh. XVIII. 5. 32-33.
3. Mbh. 1. 51. 52.
4. V. A. Smith's Early History of India (IV edition), p. 12.
5. Pradhan, preface, XI.

certain that in many cases the successor only belonged to the tribe of the predecessor and not to his family'.[1]

The Purāṇic genealogies could not have been the invention of some fertile brains. They are sometimes invented at the instance of a reigning dynasty in order to take its history to a hoary past. But such insertions are possible only at the hands of court-bards and certainly not at the hands of the Paurāṇikas who profess to tell the truth and who had nothing to gain from kings and their descendants dead and gone or from the populace. Moreover, an insertion by any particular court-poet could not have been easily accepted by the scholars who generally preserved the texts throughout the country. And it would be very difficult to compile the dynastic lists from pure imagination. The Sūtas were entrusted with the task of preserving the Purāṇic literature and so it may be said that the literature was faithfully preserved and transmitted. Therefore, it would seem that the ancient royal genealogies were carefully studied, analysed and preserved by their custodians.

The Purāṇas are so called because they are ever new[2] in spite of being old. It is necessary to collate the different Purāṇas and to correct them in the light of other references for the proper understanding of ancient Indian history. The copyists and the change of scripts and the adjectives taken as nouns or vice versa were responsible for the corruptions that have crept up into them. The Purāṇas, in their present form, no doubt, are very late productions and interpolations are made in them even in XX century.

We should always take them for what they are worth. In fact the Purāṇas are the only source that can be consulted for the major portion of the period under consideration and their study has been neglected until recent years because they require much spade work. We should

1. Indian History Congress Proceedings, Third Session, Calcutta, 1939, Dr. A. S. Altekar's Presidential Address, p. 4, Can We Reconstruct Pre-Bhārata War History?
2. Nirukta III. 18.

be neither prejudiced nor credulous about their veracity. In fact, we should always follow the middle path along with the dictates of reasons. V. A. Smith[1] says ; "The historian of the remote past of any nation must be content to rely much upon tradition as embodied in literature and to acknowledge that the results of his researches, when based upon traditionary materials are inferior to those obtainable for periods of which the facts are attested by contemporary evidence."

Buddhist Literature

Most of the Buddhistic texts, e.g., Suttas, and Jātakas are assignable to pre-Śunga times. The Buddhist texts are said to have been committed to writing for the first time during the reign of king Udayī (B.C. 484 to B.C. 468). 'They furnish a good deal of information regarding the period which immediately preceded the accession of Bimbisāra. They have also the merit of preserving the Buddhist versions of ancient stories and vouchsafe light when the light from the Brahmanical sources begins to fail.[2] The Brāhmaṇas, Bhikkus and Yatis wrote down fragment of a common pre-Buddhistic and pre-Mahāvīra tradition and we cannot afford to neglect any of these, or merely to explain them away, if they are found to be contradicting each other. They form supplementary materials of great importance in checking the traditions which are preserved in Brahmanical works. We find in the Jātakas much lesser plays of imagination and elaboration than in the Purāṇas and herein lies one of their chief recommendations. Of all the Buddhist and Jaina works, the Pali Jātakas are of unique importance as they represent the entire life and thought of an epoch in the life history of the people.

1. Early History of India (1914), Introduction p. 4.
2. Political History of Ancient India by Dr. H. C. Raichodhury, p. 9.

Jaina Texts

The Jaina cannon in its present form was probably reduced to writing in the fifth or sixth century A. C.; but there is an authentic tradition that an earlier version of the cannon existed in or about the time of Bhadrabāhu and Candragupta. The sacred literature of India was handed down orally from father to son or from teacher to pupil with the purpose of serving as a reliable check on the vagaries of manuscript copyists and it was considered a sin to rely only on written texts. The comparatively late date of the present Jaina texts and the remoteness of Magadha from the places associated with the present editions would seem to make their evidence not always reliable, but the fact remains that they speak[1] as much of Magadha as the Buddhistic sources.

Tribal Legends

'In estimating the value of tribal legendes for purposes of history it is desirable to inquire[2] whether the legends are uniform or multiform, whether any trace of modification is discernible since they were first reported, and whether they are generally accepted as true by the tribe. It is also necessary to scrutinise carefully the qualifications of those who reported them, to enquire how far they were competent to understand with precision the language of their informants, avoid the danger of voluntary suggestion and to receive the impression like a photographic plate without preconception or bias. If the records of the traditions of a tribe can stand these tests they obviously possess great value; if they fail, their value is dismissed or entirely dissappears.' In fact traditions in the absence of documents deserve more careful consideration, and tribal legends are of great value in constructing the history of Karkakhaṇḍa (Chotanagpur,) although no separate literature on the tribal legends exists.

1. Itihāsa Purāṇa, and Jātaka by S. K. Chatterjee, Woolner Volume, Lahore, 1940, pp. 34 and 36.
2. Hazaribagh District Gazetteer, 1917, p. 53.

Modern Researches

The first laudable attempt in this direction was made by F. E. Pargiter, an Indian civilian, who gave us a very learned and critical edition of 'the Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age' wherein he dwelt with the kings of the post-Mahābhārata war. He made another effort in his 'Ancient Indian Historical Traditions' to give a connected history of all the ruling dynasties of India up to the time of the Bhārata war.

Pargiter was followed by Dr. S. N. Pradhan who surveyed 'the Chronology of Ancient India from the time of the Ṛgvedic King Divodāsa to Candragupta Maurya". Dr. K. P. Jayaswal has thrown a good deal of light on the pre-Mauryan history of Bihar.

Appendix A.

YUGA THEORY.

Amongst ancient peoples the Golden Age was in the past. India is no exception. Even in the Ṛgveda[1] we come across a verse betraying the feeling that as time passes there will be progressively greater deterioration, both moral and physical. Yuga probably meant a period of four years in the beginning for Dīrghatamas[2] is said to have grown old in the tenth yuga. Whatever be the meaning attached to the word *yuga*, the Ṛgveda which uses the word '*yuga*' at least 38 times, does not contain the names of the four well-known Ages.

The word *kṛta* is used in the sense of the best throw of dice in gambling.[3] Kali is the name of the author of Ṛgveda VIII. 66. and in verse 15 of the hymn it is said, "O Descendants of Kali ! Do not be afraid". The word Kṛta, Tretā, Dvāpara and Āskanda (for Kali) occur in the Taittirīya Samhitā, Vājasaneya Samhitā and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[4] The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa[5] reads: 'To the Kṛta the master of the gambling house, to the Tretā who takes advantage of mistakes, to the Dvāpara who sits outside, and to the Kali who is like a post of the gaming house (i. e. never leaves it)'. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[6] 'One lying down becomes Kali, when about to leave the bed he becomes Dvāpara, when rising he becomes Tretā, and he becomes Kṛta when moving about'.

The Nirukta[7] makes a distinction between the sages of ancient times and those of later times. It is only in the Viṣṇudharmasūtra, the Mahābhārata, Manusmṛti, and the Purāṇas

1. RV., X., 10. 10.
2. RV., I., 158. 6.
3. RV., X., 34. 6.
4. Taitt. Sam., IV., 3. 3.; Vāj. Sam., 30. 18; Sat. Br., SBE. Vol. 44, p. 416.
5. Taittirīya Brāhmana., 5. 11.
6. Aitereya Brāhmana, XXXIII., 3.
7. Nīrukta, I. 20.

that we have a complete theory[1] of the four yugas, their characteristics and of the progressive religious, moral and physical dacadence in them. It would be impossible to fix the period when this theory was first proclaimed. But it may be conjectured that it was perfected during the five or six centuries preceding Christ when the great movement due to the genius of Buddha spread over India'.[2]

According to Pargiter[3] 'this reckoning appears to have an historical basis; though later speculations elaborated it into an amazing yet precise scheme of cosmogony. The Kṛta age ended with the destruction of the Haihayas, the Tretā began approximately with Sagara and ended with Rāma Dāśarathi's destruction of the Rākṣasas, and the Dvāpara began with his reinstatement at Ayodhyā and ended with the Bhārata battle'.

A. P. Banerji Śāstrī[4] thinks that 'each yuga stands for a particular civilisation, a distinct entity.' But the belief in the four ages of the world probably resulted from an analogy with our life. 'As in retrospect our life appears to us, so primitive man imagines the life of the world to have been : the first age was the best and the shortest, and the following ages grew worse and worse and became longer at the same time'.[5]

1. Viṣṇu. I. 3-4; Mbh. Vana. 149 & 183; Manu. I. 81-6; Barhma p. 122-3; Matsya 142-3; Nārada Purāṇa, Ch. 41.

2. P. V. Kane's 'Kalivarjya' in Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, 1936, pp. 1-18.

3. AIHT, 175-7.

4. Early Inscriptions of Bihar and Orissa, by A. Banerji Sāstrī, Patna, 1927, pp. 11-2.

5. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 45, p. 17. foot-note.

Appendix B.

NOTE ON DATE OF BHĀRATA WAR.

Almost all the kings of India took part in the great Bhārata battle on one side or the other, and the date of the Mahābhārata War is the starting point of the Purāṇic chronicler to count backward and forward. Indian tradition[1] places the War in B C. 3,137 i.e. 36 years before the beginning of the Kali Age in 3,101 B.C. But this traditional date cannot be supported in view of our advanced archaeological and palaeographical knowledge. Attempts have been made on purely independent chronological[2] and astronomical[3] data to support the traditional one. Another traditional date, accepted by Garga, Varāhamihira and Alberuni, B. C. 2,448, has been supported by some modern scholars[4] with dubious success,

Modern scholars place the War in circa 1,500 B.C. on the authority of a Purāṇic stanza which states the interval between Parīkṣita and Nanda. By taking the interval between the two, 1,500 or 1,501, to be more exact we arrive at B.C. 1,867 (326+40+1,501) as the date of Bhārata War. But it is not possible to reconcile the various data advanced for the other dates of the War and so the question of fixing the exact date of the Bhārata War must remain an open one for years to come.

1. (a) Five Thousand Years Ago—the Mahābhārata War, Journal of Indian History, Vol. XVI., pp. 239-48.

(b) Ibid. Kane.

(c) Purāṇic Date of the Mahābhārata War, by M. Rajarao, Journal of Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Allahabad, Vol. II., pp. 125-43.

(d) Date and Time of the Mahābharata—a new Approach on Astronomical consideration by K. V. Abhyankar, Annals BORI, Vol. XXV, pp. 116-36.

(e) The Exact Date of the Mahābharata War, Ganganatha Jha Research Journal, 1945.

2. The Revised Chronology of Kāśmīra Kings, JIH., Vol. XVIII., pp. 49-66

3. The Journal of Indian History, Vol. XIX, pp. 1-16.

4. Journal of Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. IV. (1938), pp. 393-413. 'Bhārata Battle Traditions, by P. C. Sen Gupta.

Appendix C.

KINGS OF MAGADHA.

Bṛhadratha Dynasty

No.	Name of Kings.	Regnal years.	From B. C		To B. C.
1. 2.	Somādhi Mārjārī	58	1867	—	1809.
3. 4.	Śrutaśravas Apratīpī	60	1890	—	1739.
5.	Ayutāyu	36	1749	—	1713.
6. 7.	Niramitra Śarmamitra	40	1713	—	1673.
8.	Surakṣa	58	1673	—	1615.
9.	Bṛhatkarman	23	1615	—	1532.
10.	Senājit	50	1592	—	1542.
11. 12.	Śatruñjaya I Mahābala or Ripuñjaya. I	40	1042	—	1502.
13.	Vibhu	28	1502	—	1474.
14.	Śuci	64	1474	—	1410.
15.	Kṣema	28	1410	—	1362.
16. 17.	Kṣemaka Anuvrata	64	1362	—	1326.
18.	Sunetra	35	1326	—	1281.
19. 20.	Nirvṛti Eman	58	1281	—	1225.
21. 22.	Trinetra Suśrama	38	1225	—	1887.
23.	Dyumatsena	48	1187	—	1139.
24. 25.	Mahīnetra Sumati	33	1139	—	1106.
26. 27.	Acala Śatruñjaya II	32	1106	—	1074.
28.	Sunīta	40	1036	—	1036.
29. 30.	Satyajit Sarvajit	83	1036	—	951.
31.	Viśvajit	35	951	—	916.
32.	Ripuñjaya II.	50	916	—	866.
	Total	1,001 years.	B. C. 1,867		to 866 B. C.

Pradyota Dynasty.

No.	Name of Kings.	Regnal Years.	From B. C. to B.C.
1.	Pradyota	23	866—848
2.	Pālaka	24	833—819
3.	Viśākhayūpa	50	919—769
4.	Sūryaka	21	769—748
5.	Nandivardhana	20	748—728
	Total	138 years.	B.C. 866 to 728B.C.

Śiśunāga Dynasty.

1.	Śiśunāga	40	728—688
2.	Kākavarṇa	26	688—662
3.	Kṣemadharman	20	662—642
4.	Kṣemavit	40	642—602
5.	Bimbisāra	51	602—551
6.	Ajātaśatru	32	551—519
7.	Darśaka	35	519—484
8.	Udayin	16	484—468
9.	Aṇiruddha	9	468—459
10.	Muṇḍa	8	459—451
11.	Nandivardhana	42	451—409
12.	Mahānandī	43	409—366
	Total	362 years.	B.C. 728 to 366B.C.

Nanda Dynasty

1.	Mahāpadma	28	366--338
2-9.	Sumālya and others	12	338—326
	Total	40 years.	B.C. 366 to 326 BC.